

The Daily Tar Heel

91st year of editorial freedom

KERRY DeROCHI, 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

Treading lightly

Amid world uproar over last week's downing of a Korean airliner by the Soviet Union, President Reagan's response in a nationally televised address Monday was surprisingly calm. Although his rhetoric was fierce, it was not backed by similarly tough action. The president acted in full knowledge that United States reaction could point the way to, or shut the door on, future U.S.-U.S.S.R. arms negotiations.

Representatives from all sides of the political arena have called on Reagan to mandate stringent sanctions to "punish" the Soviets: They expected a presidential response as severe as those after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the imposition of martial law in Poland. As could be expected, conservatives' responses to the incident have been to hit the Russians where it hurts — economically. Many angry American citizens clamor for a renewal of the embargo on sales of U.S. grain or cancellation of recently authorized U.S. sales of non-military equipment. Those actions would fulfill admirably the traditional U.S. practice of announcing unilateral economic sanctions in reaction to overseas events that generate widespread outcry.

Surprising is the fact that response from liberals and moderates has been nearly as vociferous. The dovish are more hawkish. Attitudes in the White House and on Capitol Hill have been drastically altered.

But despite the uproar, Reagan wisely elected to limit U.S. retaliatory steps to matters related almost entirely to the incident itself. Apparently the president is aware that an unnecessarily strong response would only set back any attempts to negotiate arms reductions with the Soviets. They deserve condemnation, but the door must be kept open for progress toward maintaining peace.

The Reagan administration announced three unilateral actions against the Soviets: a suspension of negotiations on a cultural agreement, a suspension of negotiations on a consulate the United States wants to open in the Soviet city of Kiev and suspension of renewal of a transportation agreement with the Soviets. Reagan also said he has "reaffirmed" an order cancelling the landing rights of the Soviet airline Aeroflot in the United States, which his administration had made in December 1981 in response to repression in Poland. Despite his denunciation of Soviet conduct in the incident as "murderous" and an "act of barbarism," Reagan said that "we must not give up our effort to bring them into the world community of nations." Reagan's sensitive and sensible reaction to the incident shows his sincere commitment to reducing the deadly weapons buildup by continuing arms-control negotiations.

Unfortunately, the Reagan administration will be forced to impose harsh sanctions if the Soviets continue to deny, water down or slough off onto the United States the responsibility of a veritable massacre. The primary goal of the Reagan administration, in conjunction with other countries, is simply to press for a full accounting of what happened and assurance from the Soviets that this type of incident will not reoccur. Until the Soviets own up, relations will continue to be strained, and the prospect for any sensible reduction in nuclear arms will remain dim.

Timely talks

The Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union may prove to be history's most enduring, insoluble confrontation. And last week, when 269 innocent people lost their lives in an ill-fated South Korean airlines flight, citizens throughout the world felt that war's chill.

Now they turn their attention toward Geneva, where U.S. arms negotiator Paul H. Nitze and Soviet delegate Yuli Kvitsinsky met Tuesday to begin discussions about limiting medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe. With the atrocity of the airline disaster looming large behind these talks, it is imperative that Nitze seize the moment and obtain concessions from the Soviet Union.

Although rooted in vastly different political and social ideologies, the U.S.-Soviet conflict has most often manifested itself in the military arena of world affairs. Each country has built its arsenal of nuclear weapons under the labels of "peace through strength" and "parity." At present, each country possesses the military strength to destroy the world; diplomatic relations have assumed an urgency unprecedented in history.

As the U.S. and the Soviet Union engage in new talks, each side's arguments are the same ones which marked the Nov. 30, 1981 beginning of negotiations following the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's announcement of its intentions to deploy U.S. cruise and Pershing 2 missiles in Europe. Each country claims that the other has a monopoly of nuclear power in Europe, that the other is the clear aggressor, that any of its own actions are merely defensive.

But the South Korean airline catastrophe has lent to this current round of talks a twist that may well prove beneficial to the United States. In his televised address to the nation Monday night, President Reagan condemned the Soviet Union for shooting down the commercial jet, calling it an action of "the U.S.S.R. against the world." Behind Reagan's often overzealous rhetoric is a shrewd political maneuver. At this crucial time for disarmament, Reagan has portrayed the United States as a country which turns the other cheek, hence making the Soviet act, already deplored by many countries, seem even more barbaric. The Soviet Union is now faced with the talks of redeeming itself in the momentarily indignant and suspicious eyes of world leaders.

Should the United States and the Soviet Union fail to reach some agreement in Geneva, the NATO allies will begin in December the deployment of the first of the U.S. cruise and Pershing 2 missiles. In light of the recent Soviet aggression, such an action is understandable. But it is not the answer. Bilateral disarmament must be Nitze's goal as he negotiates with Soviet officials. These timely talks are the best bet yet to prevent December deployment.



Old habits die hard

By S.L. PRICE

She set her books down.

"There isn't any way I'll live in Hinton James; I don't like it there; it's too far from campus. I'm just going to live in an apartment till they can get me somewhere else, that's all. And another thing, I'm prejudiced; I'll admit it. My roommate's black; I don't want to live with her. And my parents would kill me if they ever found out I had a black roommate. . . ."

— A UNC student

The leaves fall and the pages turn. Back from the last-ditch grab at freedom known as Labor Day, students now put aside the toys of summer and thoughts turn to more serious matters. Time now for the mind to work: picking up bits and pieces from readings, rejecting some lectures wholesale, retaining snatches of conversation. All combine to exercise the brain, make it work overtime, thinking, picking, choosing the philosophies to believe, which to cast stones at.

Time now for an education. But for many at the University of North Carolina, the education that costs so much ends at the classroom door. Home then to Mangum or Stacy, where the majority of residents are white; home then to South campus, where most of the black population in UNC housing lives.

Situation: A white freshman, knowing through friends or parents that the majority of blacks live south of Kenan Stadium, chooses three North campus dorms on his housing application.

Situation: A black freshman, realizing that in Cobb or Joyner she would be isolated because of the color of her skin, scribbles Ehringhaus, James and Morrison on her housing contract.

Result: A self-perpetuating atmosphere whereby blacks choose South campus for support and comfort's sake, while North campus remains a haven for whites.

It all comes down to comfort. People feel better when living with those who act, talk, look alike. Note the proliferation of fraternities and sororities. So blacks voluntarily pack up and move south. Whites move north.

Believe it or not, the purpose of a university is to stimulate the mind. And while that includes the classes you trudge to every morning, education also implies more than equations and short stories. It's the political discussion at lunch, the observations of the opposite sex in the Pit, the

Young Democrats, Republicans, Socialists, Anarchists, the Carolina Gay Association and Purdy's meat market.

But more important, it's that uncomfortable feeling you get when someone strongly challenges your way of thinking, your way of life. And ideally, you don't reject it outright. You learn to see the other perspective; you accept that yours is not the only way. You learn to respect the other guy.

Welcome to college.

Mom and Dad shouldn't know you when you get out of here.

And that's as it should be. From childhood, parents shoot their offspring full of their own prejudices and opinions. It's only natural. But once away from home, kids should find that their parents don't really agree with views formed during the Age of Eisenhower.

But now all we're talking is "shoulds." Let's talk reality. Because the enlightened white who really tries to understand the plight of a black in America is a rare commodity. The black who attempts to comprehend the shifting attitudes of whites without resentment remains nothing more than an anomaly.

Sure, Morrison, Craige, Hinton James and Ehringhaus can boast large multi-racial populations. As a result, any white or black student on South campus lives in a more diverse, more challenging environment. But call Kenan Stadium the Mason-Dixon line of UNC, because on North campus diversity is a laugh.

Two separate populations that experience only slight contact. And the stereotypes abound: No white can be trusted. All blacks are dumb. Strange music. Uncle Tom. Oversexed. Under-privileged. Stronger. Faster.

Better.

Formed during childhood and fostered during maturity, the stereotypes about each race are tossed back and forth and, if never challenged, grow stronger with age. When does it stop? And how?

Now, before the next pack of freshmen become a part of the problem, abolish any choice for freshman housing. Randomize the process and mix the incoming blacks and whites by number all over campus. The current upperclassmen can stay where they are. And if they want, those incoming freshmen can choose where they want to



live in their sophomore year; if there's a roommate problem, exceptions can be made.

Stereotypes end up looking idiotic when your roommate, although his skin is black or white, confesses to having the same basic needs and fears that you do. Racism looks asinine.

But again, we're only talking "shoulds." Old habits die hard. This one will be alive and kicking long after you pack your bags for good.

S.L. Price is a senior English major from Stamford, Conn.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Not all groups are eligible

To the editor:

I read with some amusement Joel Katzenstein's column ("Strides toward religious unity," DTH, Aug. 30). Could this be the same Katzenstein who this summer wrote a blistering attack on three religious groups generally disliked by the established religious

community? Apparently not all religious groups are eligible for Katzenstein's concept of religious unity.

In fact, the concept of religious unity is precluded by the doctrines of the religions involved. The Jewish god is the tribal god of the ancient Hebrews who through no coincidence made the

Hebrews his (her?) chosen people. (Tough luck, gentiles.) The Christian gods' contribution to religious unity was to mandate belief in Jesus so as to be saved — or otherwise to be condemned. Neither maintains policies particularly conducive to religious unity.

In view of a history of religious wars and intolerance, it seems John Lennon and his song "Imagine" has a more

viable solution than religious unity: Imagine there's no heaven It's easy if you try No hell below us Above us only sky Imagine all the people Living for today . . . Nothing to kill or die for And no religion too.

Allan Rosen Carboro



Thanks for a choice

To the editor:

Thank you for publishing the information provided by one of your readers concerning alternate choices of religious worship in the area. I hope that others will send in any additional information. The Triangle area has everything from the Apostolic Church to Zen Buddhism, and no one should feel that the only freedom of worship

around here is among various Protestant denominations. Even atheists have a place here. That is as it should be in a democracy. In these days of right-wing religious fanatics, I hope we all remember that fact.

Boyd Bronson Chapel Hill

Sunrise, sunset — 'when?' a tough question

By JEFF HIDAY

For Congress, the past summer was brisk — one in which foreign policy and defense issues beat out the economy as the peskiest topics on Capitol Hill, one in which lawmakers preoccupied themselves with the MX missile and U.S. involvement in Central America.

But the congressmen, never ones to misdirect priorities, were also concerned with U.S. involvement in Mother Nature's affairs. Lawmakers keen on conserving energy, reducing crime and making available more daylight leisure time, introduced legislation that would move the start of daylight-saving time from the last Sunday in April to the first Sunday in March.

The effect would be to make sunrises and sunsets an hour later during March and April. As far as issues go, this may not be as big as the nuclear freeze, but what else would prompt farmers to unite with drive-in movie operators to do battle with a charcoal manufacturer and an amateur softball association?

Congressional debate over the perennial issue ended with a vote that killed the proposal to extend daylight-saving time. But the idea still lives (and probably will forever). The argumentation employed, never dull but often ludicrous, is worthy of examination.

Reduce temperature in summer

Dissenters from such a plan are mainly those from rural areas and western edges of time zones, where March sunrises would be as late as 8 a.m. under daylight-saving time. They point to the problem of schoolchildren's having to wait for morning school buses in the dark. Also, they say the change would interfere with farm operations; many farmers cannot begin work until the sun rises.

"People who bale hay or harvest small grain have to wait until the dew dries before they can start working," a representative of the American Farm Bureau Federation argues. "If they start later, they have to work later, and it cuts into the amount of time they can spend at church or civic activities in the evening."

That's the line of reasoning followed by Sen. Wendell Ford, D-Ky., who has always managed to tie up the bill in committee and prevent it from reaching the floor for a vote. Similar legislation was approved on a 243-165 vote in the House in 1981 but was never considered in the Senate, thanks to Ford. The Kentucky senator's strong-arm tactics were unnecessary this summer, however, as the House rejected the bill 199-211 in mid-July. Ford says he sees no need to tinker with time so people in white shorts can yell "Love - 30" an hour later in the day.

As yet, no one has raised national security considerations about the legislation, but at one time or another the proposal has been linked to farmers' civic participation, schoolchildren's safety, crime against women and cows' productivity.

... the country can save more oil, painlessly, by saving a little more light. The Soviets manage well setting their clocks ahead two hours every April through September.

One House member says the legislation may inspire him to introduce a bill that would reduce the temperature in the summer and raise it in the winter by 10 degrees. "It makes just about as much sense," said Rep. Pat Roberts, R-Kan.

There's some sense to it

There are numerous pragmatic reasons for which to support the extension of daylight-saving time. The longer daylight results in energy savings, increased tourism and other benefits. There is more time to work, to run errands, to recreate.

Proponents counter the safety argument with a Transportation Department study showing that fatalities involving schoolchildren did not increase during a temporary extension of daylight-saving time in 1974 and 1975. Daylight-saving time was lengthened then as an energy-saving measure during the Arab oil embargo.

For every day it spends on daylight time, the country can get along with the equivalent of 100,000 fewer barrels

of oil — a 2 percent reduction in petroleum imports. And the country can save more oil, painlessly, by saving a little more light. The Soviets manage well setting their clocks ahead two hours every April through September.

The proposition is modest: Extend from six months to eight months the period of daylight-saving time. Benjamin Franklin advocated it as a way to save candles. It was used in World War I to save coal. Why not now to save oil?

Don't forget vested interests

Although national energy conservation is often cited as the main reason for the time change, the big push for the legislation comes from groups with more parochial interests.

Thus, the Clorox Co., manufacturer of charcoal, backed the bill because more daylight hours after work should mean more backyard barbecues. The Amateur Softball Association favored the bill because it would allow more time on unlighted fields in March and April for sports. And the Southland Corp. supported it because market research shows crime-conscious working women are more likely to stop at 7-Eleven stores on their way home if it is light outside.

"It's a boon to business," a representative of the National Association of Convenience Stores said. "People tend to be out more in the light than in darkness."

Also backing the bill is the National Retinitis Pigmentosa Foundation, Inc., which represents the more than 400,000 Americans with night blindness.

The issue will never be moot. Perhaps the compound virtues of saving light and oil will dawn on the 99th Congress.

Jeff Hiday, a junior journalism and history major from Charlotte, is associate editor of The Daily Tar Heel.