

Reagan's scheme hurts talks

Recently President Reagan said that even if the nuclear arms race was ended the United States would still want to develop Star Wars. In layman's terms Star Wars is a space-based defense system of offensive weapons.

The way the nuclear arms situation stands now both the United States and the Soviet Union have more than enough fire power to destroy each other. The nuclear issue has gained so much media attention increasing public awareness to the extent that more pressure is being placed on the government of the USSR and the U.S. to stop the deployment of nuclear weapons.

The most recent arms talks in Geneva didn't look as promising as they could have been because of the President's implicit instructions to refuse to use Star Wars as a bargaining chip.

At the present time, Reagan intends to continue with research despite what effect it might have on future arms reduction talks. Reagan supports this by saying that the only weapon that we have against the USSR is the knowledge that we can destroy each other; therefore we need an edge. The Soviet Union is quick to point out that during the past two major wars the U.S. has been the one to use nuclear weapons, not the USSR.

Congress is also a little skeptical about the Star Wars plan in the sense that it is afraid that the Russians will not see it as an act of good faith. The Soviet Union has enforced this opinion during the Geneva talks. The Russians let it be known that they did not and would not tolerate the deployment of the Star Wars plan. President Reagan has made it clear that he believes that his space-based defense plan would be needed even if the super powers agreed to abolish all nuclear weapons.

Reagan is so confident about Star Wars that the program is receiving a sharp increase in funds from Reagan's budget. No expense is being spared in trying to gain support from U.S. allies. Recently Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger delivered a speech before a security seminar in West Germany appealing to Western European nations to support the Reagan administration's

space defense program. It is President Reagan's hope that with the development of Star Wars both sides will agree to reduce their nuclear arsenals.

Critics of the plan say that if the plans for Star Wars continue, it is very probable that more offensive weapons systems will be developed to circumvent them. Unless some sort of compromise is reached, the future arms reduction talks will prove as unprofitable as the Geneva talks did. (Pamela Gary)

Are you being victimized by self-enslavement?

The year is 1985 and where do we go from here? Take a look at history. For so long our sisters have been oppressed, used and abused, but through it all they fought on and exemplified the determination and strength that was part of their nature.

We are the daughters of African kings and queens. The period of slavery was very demeaning. Some say it is over. But when we fail to live up to our character, fail to be what we can be, deny ourselves what is rightfully ours and entrap ourselves in our own ignorance, is this not slavery?

We look at prostitutes as degrading persons with no sense of value or respect for themselves, but we play games with others in order to disclose a side of our being we are not and settle for whatever we can get without question. Is this not prostitution?

If we are to be the women we were meant to be, exhibiting the character of our ancestors, we must stop enslaving ourselves; we must stop prostituting ourselves; we must begin to examine our inner ideals, values and goals.

Then and only then can we move ahead. The year is 1985. We must get our priorities in order, make a conscientious decision about what we want to do and expect, and make this year a solid foundation for continued growth.

(Karen R. Taylor)

There's a dupe born every minute

a column
by Vicky Dunn

The wonder of the circus never ceases to thrill me. Flashing, sequined outfits; blinking lights that keep time with my heart and the bass drum in the orchestra; sticky cotton candy and every other fattening treat sold at astronomical prices all typify the circus. But it's the gaudy kind of adventure one can only stand to go on once a year.

Unfortunately, something about the circus urges me to spend, spend and spend more! I am a victim of cunning advertising schemes. I bought one stuffed animal after one book after one balloon after another balloon, until my arms were fairly dragging the ground with precious booty. I bought things without any particular purpose but that filled my need to buy. If you think of such an expenditure as a small rip-off, and have not recognized the larger one, let me remove the proverbial scales from your eyes.

I love the circus almost as much as any other young adult whose entertainments can range from anything like that to something

totally unchildlike. But, I still know a dupe when I see one. The major attraction at this year's show was the "living unicorn." (Just between us, pampered sheep do strange unicorns make.)

So who is responsible for this year's gross misadvertising? If we blame the show's producers, we must also realize our responsibility. We demand that the "Greatest Show On Earth" be unearthly.

Advertisers purposefully present illusions. Once they get our attention, they literally can't afford to lose it. And yes, they will even lie to get it. What happens more often, though, is that they simply divert us and subtly con us. The unicorn promotion was blatant, however.

Throughout the show, I couldn't help wondering if anyone really believed the lie, or worse yet, if we didn't care that it was a lie. Do we calmly sit by as others bombard us with misinformation simply because we want to be entertained?

Perhaps promoters only want to appease our demands for the impossible, and we are the real culprits. The real tragedy lies there—that we settle for nothing.

Did he or didn't he?

"Atlanta Child Murders" Produces dissatisfaction

a column
by Dee Evans

The docudrama, "The Atlanta Child Murders," which aired Feb. 10 and 12, was not considered as one of television's greatest productions, nor did it come close.

This docudrama just caused controversy among its producers, disturbances with those actually involved with the incidents and confusion among the viewers. It is as if a group of people took a serious situation and for entertainment purposes turned it into a comedy.

Many of the viewers agree that the docudrama was not a good representation of the actual account. According to junior Amanda Smith, an English major from Charlotte, "I was totally disappointed with the movie. Williams was portrayed as a

comedian out for jokes. The sensitivity of the actual incident was lost because of poor representation."

The movie tended to sway towards the idea that Wayne Williams was innocent. In addition, viewers feel that they were not presented with a clear, precise picture of the actual incident. The viewers were left puzzled and confused. Sophomore Melanie Hubbard, a journalism major from Indianapolis, says, "the movie gave me insight into the trial itself; however, it didn't tell me anything about the murders of the children in detail."

Freshman psychology major, Kim Mozingo from Detroit, agrees, saying, "basically I couldn't come to any conclusion as to whether Williams was innocent or guilty because all the substantial evidence was not presented in

the movie."

Moreover, the movie created an uproar of opinions. Some people remained with their first impression, and some changed their minds after watching the movie. Others still remain undecided as to whether or not Williams was guilty. "I feel Williams was unjustly punished," says nursing major Countess Canady, a sophomore from Winston-Salem.

Sophomore Lisa Matthews, a pre-law major says, "I don't feel that Williams' trial was justice. I can only say that there was proven evidence against him. I hope someday, somehow that this case will become solved in a way that would satisfy the parents of the deceased."

Perhaps the only accomplishment of the show was to make the murders a subject of conversation again.

Letter to the Editor: Amnesty International asks aid in stopping human rights violations in Peru

To the Editor.

Atrocities committed by Peruvian government forces in the country's remote highland provinces have reached unprecedented levels in the country's modern history, according to a report released by Amnesty International in January. Hundreds of Peruvians have

been tortured and killed during the last two years, and more than 1,000 have disappeared after government agents seized them without warrant from their homes. Many of the victims are students and teachers killed because of their alleged association with the Shining Path armed opposition group.

An army patrol abducted Pedro Gomez, a university student, when he returned from Lima to his parents' rural home 18 months ago. He has not been seen since the abduction. Argumedes Ascarza, an 18-year-old student from the Ayacucho highlands, also remains among the "disappeared." Hooded men dressed in army uniforms abducted him from his home in July 1983.

Massive human rights violations began to occur in Peru in December 1982 when the government of President Fernando Belaunde Terry placed nine western provinces under military rule. Shining Path guerrillas have been especially active in these provinces, targeting government security personnel and local community leaders for execution-style killings. Last summer the government extended the Emergency Zone to 13 provinces.

Despite domestic and international protest against the "dirty wars" waged by government authorities, military forces, Peruvian police and the civil guard continue to violate citizens' human rights with impunity. While condemning

the killings and other abuses committed by the Shining Path, Amnesty International has called upon the government of President Belaunde to observe international standards for protection of individual citizens' fundamental human rights.

Students and teachers in the Emergency Zone have suffered brutal treatment, in part because young people have been recruited into the guerrilla movement. Evidence compiled by Amnesty International suggests that military agents suspect young people of participating in guerrilla activity.

Victims of government agents also include farmers, lawyers, journalists and leaders of peasant organizations and trade unions. Security forces have dumped or buried hundreds of bodies at several sites in the Emergency Zone.

Fifty bodies were found in seven shallow graves at one site last summer. At other sites military authorities have obstructed exhumation or identification of corpses, which often bear marks of torture and a single gunshot wound in the head. Removal of clothing, severing of fingers, and

the mutilation of facial features render identification difficult.

A Peruvian woman testified that she and her daughter had searched for her missing son "at the place where the dead bodies appear. But we have only found the collar of his shirt, which the marines used as a blindfold on another person."

Numerous victims of "disappearance" were last seen alive at one of two government detention centers. The Huanta Stadium, a concrete structure built in 1974 for sporting events, serves as a provincial naval command headquarters. Authorities have denied detaining many of the prisoners held under the grandstand and in open areas of the stadium.

Los Cabitos Barracks, a regional army headquarters, reportedly serves as the Emergency Zone's main interrogation and detention center. Prisoners released from the barracks have testified that they saw people held there whom authorities denied detaining. These testimonies support evidence that guards in the barracks systematically torture detainees.

(See page 3)

The Bennett Banner

Editor-in-Chief Dee Evans
Associate Editors Avanti Allen, Alaina Cloud
Vicky Dunn, Tricia Hairston, Karen R. Taylor
Reporters Chandra Austin, Yvonne Breece, Karen Exum
Margo Gilmore, Mardell Griffin, Shonna Luten
Ellesia McCracken, Bernice Scott
Adviser Michael Gaspeny

Opinions expressed in columns and letters to the editor belong to the authors, not to the staff of the Banner.

Send letters to the editor to Box 2. All mail must be signed by hand.