

The Daily Tar Heel

94th year of editorial freedom

JIM ZOOK, *Editor*
 RANDY FARMER, *Managing Editor*
 ED BRACKETT, *Associate Editor*
 DEWEY MESSER, *Associate Editor*
 TRACY HILL, *News Editor*
 GRANT PARSONS, *University Editor*
 LINDA MONTANARI, *City Editor*
 JILL GERBER, *State and National Editor*
 SCOTT FOWLER, *Sports Editor*
 KATHY PETERS, *Features Editor*
 ROBERT KEEFE, *Business Editor*
 ELIZABETH ELLEN, *Arts Editor*
 DAN CHARLSON, *Photography Editor*

Editorials

Alien law no solution

For the signing of such landmark legislation as the immigration bill, there was a distinct lack of hurrahs last week — but there was little cause for celebration.

Immigration reform has been needed to control the flood of illegal aliens into the United States, most entering from across the Mexican border. The aliens usually are underpaid, poorly housed and exploited by employers while U.S. law almost encourages the exploitation: it is illegal for aliens to be in this country, but not against the law to hire them.

The law provides amnesty for some illegal immigrants. It penalizes employers who knowingly hire illegal aliens — the theory being that with few available jobs, foreigners will be discouraged from entering the country. But after five years of compromise and revision, the watered-down legislation temporarily addresses a problem at the expense of immigration officials, legal aliens and businesses.

Besides its regular duties, the INS must process amnesty requests from 4 million illegal aliens (plus 8 million to 12 million relatives) and the 400,000 migrant farm workers allowed to work. To qualify, illegal immigrants must prove U.S. residency since Jan.

1, 1982. But experts estimate that more than 3 million people have entered the United States illegally since then, and the INS must still hunt them down.

Businessmen — aware of the severe fines that can be levied — may use the law as an excuse not to hire legal aliens or minorities. Recognizing that danger, the new law also prohibits refusal to hire job candidates just because they are not U.S. citizens. The provision will be difficult to enforce.

For those illegal immigrants willing to come forward, the legislation means protection against exploitation. But many believe even those eligible for amnesty will not apply, out of long-held fear of federal officials.

The new law, while better than its predecessor, treats a deep wound with a band-aid. Congress must decide whether the aliens benefit the American economy by taking jobs no one else wants, or if they take jobs from Americans at less-than-legal pay. The answer could initiate a desperately needed long-term policy — if more work passes should be granted or Congress should better fund the INS.

Otherwise, Congress may have to offer another blanket amnesty in another 15 years.

Hostages pawns in larger game

U.S. hostage David Jacobsen was released Sunday after an incredible 17 months of captivity in Lebanon. The reasons for his freedom remain ambiguous. Of course, in the turmoil-racked world of Lebanese politics, ambiguity is the order of the day.

Jacobsen was kidnapped in May 1985 by Shiite Moslems of the pro-Iranian faction Islamic Jihad. The kidnapers hoped to procure the release of Jihad soldiers imprisoned in Kuwait for bombing the U.S. and French embassies. Those soldiers are still in jail; as a result, Islamic Jihad continues to hold at least two Americans hostage. Nineteen foreigners are reported held hostage in Lebanon.

One of the more fascinating aspects of Jacobsen's release is the role of Anglican Church emissary Terry Waite. Waite serves as chief negotiator with Jihad and helped free Jacobsen. But his part in the drama reveals the entire Lebanese political situation as a huge chess game.

In this game, fought on the board of world sentiment, the hostages are the pawns. Waite has thus become the instrument through which both the Shiites and the United States attempt to control those pawns.

Islamic Jihad issued a statement following Jacobsen's release saying,

"We remind the (American people) that we will adopt a different policy line if the U.S. government does not continue its overtures to achieve the desired results." The statement pictures Jacobsen's freedom as a reward for some unstated U.S. action. Not surprisingly, the United States denied such overtures were made, but emphasized its own role in patiently working with Waite for the release.

When the Soviet Union arrested U.S. reporter Nicholas Daniloff, the United States quickly negotiated for his release. Families of the Lebanese hostages used the Daniloff case to argue that the Reagan administration could and should do the same with Islamic Jihad and the other groups.

The reality of the situation, though, as demonstrated by Sunday's announcement, is that the United States has no power, no authority in Lebanon. The hostages can look only to their captors for the hope of freedom. And the inscrutability of Islamic Jihad makes such freedom a capricious prospect indeed.

Often, events like a hostage release are probed for a greater significance. But Jacobsen's release has little meaning other than the importance of one man's freedom. To search for anything more is to search in vain.

The Daily Tar Heel

Editorial Writer: Kathy Nanney
Editorial Assistant: Nicki Weisense
Omnibus Editor: Sallie Krawcheck

Assistant Managing Editors: Jennifer Cox, Amy Hamilton, Donna Leinwand and Regan Murray.

News: Jeanna Baxter, Stephanie Burrow, Charlotte Cannon, Chris Chapman, Paul Cory, Sabrina Darley, Kimberly Edens, Michelle Efrid, Jennifer Essen, Jennie Faris, Scott Greig, Maria Haren, Nancy Harrington, Suzanne Jeffries, Susan Jensen, Sharon Keschull, Michael Kolb, Teresa Kriegsmann, Laura Lance, Alicia Lassiter, Mitra Lotfi, Brian Long, Justin McGuire, Karen McManis, Laurie Martin, Toby Moore, Dan Morrison, Felisa Neuringer, Rachel Orr, Fred Patterson, Liz Saylor, Sheila Simmons, Rachel Stiffler, Elisa Turner, Beth Williams, Robert Wilderman and Bruce Wood. Jo Fleischer and Jean Lutes, *assistant university editors*. Donna Leinwand, *assistant state and national editor*. Cindy Clark, Ruth Davis and Michael Jordan, *wire editors*.

Sports: Mike Berardino, James Surowiecki and Bob Young, *assistant sports editors*. Bonnie Bishop, Greg Cook, Phyllis Fair, Laura Gimmer, Clay Hodges, Greg Humphreys, Lorna Khalil, Eddy Landreth, Mike Mackay, Jill Shaw and Wendy Stringfellow.

Features: Jessica Brooks, Julie Braswell, Eleni Chamis, Robbie Dellinger, Carole Ferguson, Jennifer Frost, Jennifer Harley, Jeanie Mamo, Corin Ortlam, Lynn Phillips, Katie White, Mollie Womble and Susan Wood.

Arts: James Burrus, David Hester, Alexandra Mann, Rene Meyer, Beth Rhea, Kelly Rhodes and Rob Sherman.

Photography: Charlotte Cannon, Larry Childress, Jamie Cobb, Tony Deifell, Janet Jarman and Julie Stovall.

Copy Editors: Karen Anderson, *assistant news editor*. Dorothy Batts, Beverly Imes, Lisa Lorentz, Sherri Murray, Sally Pearsall, Marielle Stachura and Joy Thompson.

Editorial Cartoonists: Adam Cohen, Bill Cokas and Trip Park.

Campus Calendar: Mindelle Rosenberg and David Starnes.

Business and Advertising: Anne Fulcher, *general manager*; Patricia Benson, *advertising director*; Mary Pearce, *advertising coordinator*; Angela Ostwalt, *business manager*; Cammie Henry, *accounts receivable clerk*; Michael Benfield, *advertising manager*; Ruth Anderson, Michael Benfield, Jennifer Garden, Kelli McElhany, Chrissy Mennitt, Beth Merrill, Anne Raymer, Julie Settle, Peggy Smith, Kent Sutton, Ashley Waters, and Layne Poole *advertising representatives*; Tammy Norris, Angie Peele, Stephanie Chesson, *classified advertising representatives*; and Mary Brown, *secretary*.

Distribution/circulation: William Austin, *manager*.

Production: Elizabeth Rich and Stacy Wynn. Rita Galloway, *production assistant*.

Tar Heel Forum

SDI won't solve arms race problem

Falk/Campbell
 Guest Writers

The Strategic Defense Initiative (or Star Wars) is an abstract idea with vital implications. President Reagan is sold on SDI and is doing his best to sell the idea to the American people. Congress has appropriated 13 billion dollars over the past four fiscal years for basic research; no one knows how much SDI will eventually cost, but the amount will surely be in the hundreds of billions of dollars.

The politically savvy folks connected with SDI have said they want to put SDI money into every state, creating the biggest pork-barrel project in history. If this happens, SDI will be very difficult to stop a few years down the road. We therefore need to cut through the rhetoric surrounding the issue and consider it carefully.

One thing Star Wars almost certainly cannot be is the leakproof "peace shield" that President Reagan fondly insists will protect American cities. Even the director of the SDI Office, Lt. Gen. James Abrahamson, admits that Star Wars is designed to protect U.S. missiles. But unless it can be made 100 percent effective, SDI will not be an acceptable defense against a Soviet first-strike; the Soviets could defeat it any number of ways with existing technology, including simply building more missiles.

However, SDI might be valuable in a U.S. first strike and might greatly reduce incoming missiles. In other words, it could be used as an offensive system. The technological fine points merely suggest that the popular perception of SDI is flawed. Our argument is that SDI is an attempt to construct a technological solution to a non-technological problem — the arms race — and is doomed to failure.

To paraphrase a popular conservative argument: missiles don't kill people, people kill people. While missiles can be used to kill lots of human beings very efficiently and anonymously, the missiles themselves are neither moral or immoral. Making missiles unusable will accomplish nothing if the will to use them still exists.

History shows that new technology has never produced anything but a temporary advantage for one side, with an overall

escalation in the economic and social costs of the arms race. Rather than working down from the current level of armament to create a more stable world, Star Wars seeks to create a stable escalation, which seems unlikely to be successful.

If we test and eventually deploy SDI, the Soviet Union may do the same five to 10 years later. History also shows us that the interim periods between technological gains tend to be less stable. Parity, not superiority, has proven to be safest for both countries in a nuclear world.

Star Wars is therefore a wrongheaded and destabilizing approach to controlling of nuclear weapons. So, taking what we know about each other into account, what is the Realpolitik of arms control for the United States and the Soviet Union? The pragmatic solution seems to be a continuation of the political process.

We mean not only summits, but U.S.-Soviet contact on every political level. High-level summits are very positive, but important groundwork is laid in lower-level meetings. In the 1970s, the SALT treaties provided diplomatic avenues for resolving problems over compliance. But during the Reagan administration, these lower-level contacts have been sharply reduced.

Until the early 1980s, every question that arised was resolved to the satisfaction of U.S. committee members. Early in his first term, President Reagan suspended this lower-level diplomacy, preferring to voice his complaints in the media. The talks at Geneva are a very positive step, and we applaud the administration's effort to resume the arms control struggle in summits.

However, we must be willing to compromise. If we go into a negotiation unwilling to put everything on the table at some level, we are not negotiating in good faith. The current attitude that "if the Soviets want it, it can't be good for us" is naive and

shortsighted. We should never accept a treaty which puts us at a strategic disadvantage, nor should we expect the Soviets to do so.

The Soviets' Reykjavik offer gave the United States everything it has wanted for years: open verification of missile sites, real reductions in Euromissiles and potentially deep strategic cuts. The price for this was an agreement to keep Star Wars in the laboratory for 10 years — not to kill development of the program but to delay field testing.

Reagan's commitment to SDI was so strong that he flatly refused the Soviet proposal on this single condition. He is obviously a true believer in the ability of Star Wars to end the threat of nuclear war. While his faith defies all reason, the popular conception of SDI is one hell of a symbol, and the Great Communicator has shown a grasp of the importance of symbolism.

As long as the public believes, as Reagan does, that Star Wars will make them safer (just as they have believed all along that the arms race was necessary for their safety), we will escalate and bring the world closer to destruction. It's time to halt escalation and work for verifiable reductions of nuclear weapons. That's the pragmatic way to improve our safety.

The only certain result of an ongoing, intensive SDI research and testing is escalating the arms race, with attendant political instability. The path of SDI is wide and seductive compared to the steep and narrow road of negotiation and compromise. It is the latter road, however, that offers the only promise of reduced nuclear threat and lasting peace.

We encourage Ronald Reagan to look toward the difficult and arduous political solutions, rather than the false promises of SDI. He must be willing to make fair tradeoffs in hardware to solve the human problem of nuclear weapons.

Adam Falk is a senior physics major from Chapel Hill and a member of Students Taking Action for Nuclear Disarmament. Barry Campbell is a junior English major from Raleigh.

Education drive

To the editor:

The South African situation worsens with every headline it generates. UNC students look on and want to ameliorate the pain felt by South African blacks. However, South Africa is moving toward a system of equality for all, without regard to race. But when this new South Africa arrives, will the blacks be prepared?

South Africa spends eight times as much to educate a white child as it does for a black child. A white who seeks college funding usually gets it. Blacks who are admitted to colleges can rarely go because they barely have enough money to meet basic needs.

The result is that blacks are largely uneducated or undereducated. When "one man, one vote" is instated, blacks may find themselves sadly lacking qualified candidates to fill positions.

The South African Scholarship Fund, a new Campus Y committee, seeks to provide an education for future black leaders now, thus helping to safeguard that country's future.

Members of the Board of Trustees have agreed to match what we can raise within the next two years, up to \$50,000. This \$100,000 will be placed in an Endowment Fund at a 10 percent annual interest rate. The interest will be sent every year to the South African Institute of Race Relations, which will handle the allocation of scholarships.

This institute is a non-government, non-profit organization seeking to foster non-violent processes of change towards democracy in South Africa. Its only stance is anti-apartheid. Candidates seeking to go to college in South Africa are eligible if they meet financial need and academic eligibility requirements. Scholarships will be awarded regardless of sex, race, religion or political affiliation.

With our \$100,000 endowment, we will be able to finance four students for each year as necessary. When the fund is no longer needed, it will provide scholarships to North Carolina residents to attend UNC.

Efforts to raise funds will be focused on corporations in UNC's portfolio that do business in South Africa, and the Chapel Hill area and the University community itself. This is a project of students, by students and for students. The involvement of the student body as a whole is important for the attainment of this rather ambitious goal.

There will be a table in the Pit on Wednesday. SASF T-shirts will be on sale and there will be a sign-up sheet for all people interested in volunteering a little time. Donations will NOT be refused. Maybe

JIM BROYHILL	R	06%
TERRY SANFORD	D	11%
BRUCE WILLIS	WRITE-IN	83%

UNCle polls ☆

A. DIXON, DAILY TARHEEL

The Daily Tar Heel welcomes reader comment. For style and clarity, we ask that you observe the following guidelines for letters to the editor and columns:

- All letters/columns must be signed by the author(s). Limit of two signatures per letter or column.
- Students who submit letters/columns should also include their name, year in school,

major and phone number. Professors and other University employees should include their title and department.

- All letters/columns must be typed. (For easier editing, we ask that they be double-spaced on a 60-space line.)
- The Daily Tar Heel reserves the right to edit letters and columns for style, grammar and accuracy.

together, we can make South Africa a better place to live.

GRAHAM ENTWHISTLE
 Junior
 Psychology/Sociology

Respect religion

To the editor:

It troubled me to see the editorial, "Fundamental faith, freedom," in the Oct. 29 Daily Tar Heel. The writer stated that Judge Hull's decision to permit children to skip reading classes that used material alien to their religious beliefs was flawed, as it might lead to "cafeteria" education, and that education must foster respect for all opinions without denying the validity of others.

He further stated that limits advocated by a spokesman for the fundamentalist group have no place in the public education system, and that an alternative is to place children in private school.

I see two problems with this approach. First, the fundamentalist position is that the materials used are opposed to their beliefs. Even if we don't have a problem with the same items, their plight is in the same category as children of atheists being forced to participate in school prayer, or children of Mennonites being forced to participate in school sponsored pro-military activities, such as ROTC. We do not have the right to deny others freedom of religious expression, even if we don't agree with their religion.

Secondly, to offer private education as an option is problematic. Not all parents have the financial resources to send their children to private school, but their lack of funds should not negate their right of freedom of religious expression. If Judge Hull's decision is overturned, however, this may be the practical result.

PAT PATTERSON
 Graduate
 Organizational Behavior

Good, clean fun

To the editor:

In response to Mark Good ("Get primeval," Oct. 27), I wish to address a few issues.

Monsieur Good, did you know that almost 3/4 of UNC's student population cannot legally drink and act like "primordial beasts?" If the Union Social Committee ever plans to have a campus get together with "real bands" and offer alcohol, I guess that 3/4 of the so-called "underage geeks" at this great institution will not be able to attend.

I am a "self-respecting Carolina student" and when one isn't old enough for drinking, there is nothing better to do than act like an immature kid and have some good, clean fun. There were actually some seniors — yes, seniors — having a good time playing those inane Twister games and hopping up and down on pogo sticks. The All-Campus Bash sponsored by the Union proves that we can

actually have a good time without being in a drunken stupor. As a matter of fact, I believe that I saw Good trying to hide his grinning countenance while attempting to put his right hand on the red circle under a female's rear end.

Also, Good obviously forgot that besides S, G, and L's stellar performance, another band played. This band, The White Animals, one of Chapel Hill's favorite progressive rock bands, had UNC students rocking so hard that our Union's ceiling nearly fell through.

Just because a band originated at UVA, one of UNC's arch-rivals, doesn't mean that they cannot be good. Spiedel, Goodrich and Lille are three very talented guys that please audiences with their music at many colleges around the East Coast.

For those that agree with Good's article attacking the "crap" that went on at the Union Bash, open your narrow minds. Just a few years ago, you also did not have the privilege of drinking legally.

And congratulations to Alex Dickey, Director of the Union Social Committee; he and his committee put in a lot of time and effort to provide UNC students with a good time. I enjoyed the bash and both bands, but please don't take Mark Good's advice to have a Care Bear Movie Festival.

DANNY ROSIN
 Senior
 Early Childhood Education