

# 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

### Continuation of the fiasco

How can relations between two nations so deteriorate in just two weeks? U.S.-Soviet relations have become infested with a case of the post-Iceland Summit bug, eating up any shred of credibility it can find. Superpower negotiators desperately need to salvage some snippet of respect for each other.

The first 10 days after the summit were dominated by the childish expulsion of diplomats and limits placed on the actions of embassies in the two nations. After 75 American-based Soviets were sent home and 10-Soviet-based Americans were booted, a truce was declared. This seemingly brought an end to the "tit-for-tat" games, as one Soviet official labeled the fiasco.

Keep dreaming. Disputes have now arisen over President Reagan's degree of consent for Soviet arms proposals offered at the Iceland summit. The Soviets claimed Reagan sought to eliminate all strategic nuclear missiles — a contradiction to the president's public stances at home. White House officials have since said the president agreed to that in principle, but did not offer any specific resolutions to that aim.

This conflict yields two possibilities. The instinctive reaction of most red-

blooded Americans would be to accuse the Soviets of lying for their own benefit. Muddying the waters and picturing the U.S.' leadership as confused about its own positions could drum up international support. That probably wouldn't be too hard, considering the fact that several Western European allies to the United States have already criticized U.S. handling of the Iceland summit.

But the more likely explanation, unfortunately, seems to be that the White House isn't sure what happened or what it said in Iceland. Since returning from Reykjavik, conflicting reports have emerged from the White House about statements and actions made by Reagan and Secretary of State George Shultz. This confusion is compounded by the White House's refusal to release transcripts of any part of the disputed dialogue. The two sides even disagree on whether Reagan or Gorbachev made the first move to end one of the sessions.

Such vacillation and shaky leadership cannot be relied upon when discussing the defense systems of the two most powerful nations in the history of civilization. The American public should demand that the White House shun this sloppy diplomacy.

### Vanguard of cooperation

Hard as it may be to believe, there exists a place in the world where representatives of battling nations can (and do) confer without using weapons, a place where dignified debate takes precedence over strident political rhetoric. And Geneva, Switzerland, has another plus: many apparently regard it as a more effective forum than the United Nations, given the large numbers of countries — capitalist, socialist or otherwise — that regularly do business there.

On Saturday, the Geneva-based International Red Cross, meeting in the city, unwittingly threw a stone at the dove Geneva represents by voting to suspend South Africa's membership in the organization — which has been typically neutral in the past and often a force of good even in repressive countries.

At its best, the vote represents an act of courage, since the Red Cross had never before suspended a member and was obviously concerned about setting a precedent. The vote was also an act of conscience: Red Cross members clearly wanted to send a message to the perpetrators of apartheid, to tell them that they are not welcome in such a humane organization.

A definite political statement was

made, but was the Red Cross acting in its best interest? The organization has cultivated a remarkable reputation over the years for its disaster relief programs — a reputation that is largely free of criticisms on political grounds, something that can't be said of many U.N. agencies.

In other words, the Red Cross helps people, not governments; indeed, political squabbles can only hinder the Red Cross' benevolent work. The organization has rightfully avoided politics in the past.

Saturday's vote for expelling the South African delegation, though, represents a reversal of that honorable tradition. Fortunately, some nations (including the United States) recognized the dangers of politicizing the organization and protested. But their efforts proved a failure: 159 nations voted to oust the South Africans, while only 25 voted to keep the delegation.

The Red Cross has been a vanguard of governmental cooperation toward human good since its inception. "Cooperation" includes everyone — even countries with repressive governments (and there are, unfortunately, a lot of them). Ousting the South Africans may not only deprive apartheid's victims of much-needed help, but may also jeopardize the spirit of Geneva.

### The Daily Tar Heel

Editorial Writer: Kathy Nanney  
 Omnibus Editor: Sallie Krawcheck

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

News: Jeanna Baxter, Stephanie Burrow, Charlotte Cannon, Chris Chapman, Paul Cory, Sabrina Darley, Kimberly Edens, Michelle Efrid, Jennifer Essen, Jeannie Farris, Scott Greig, Maria Haren, Nancy Harrington, Timothy Harrison, Suzanne Jeffries, Susan Jensen, Sharon Keschull, Michael Kolb, Teresa Kringsman, Laura Lance, Alicia Lassiter, Mitra Lotfi, Brian Long, Justin McGuire, Karen McManis, Laurie Martin, Tracey Maxwell, Toby Moore, Dan Morrison, Felisa Neuringer, Rachel Orr, Fred Patterson, Liz Saylor, Sheila Simmons, Rachel Stiffler, Elisa Turner, Nicki Weisensee, 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*.

Spot: Mike Berardino, James Surowiecki and Bob Young, *assistant sports editors*. Bonnie Bishop, Greg Cook, Phyllis Fair, Laura Grimmer, 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, Laura Lance, Corin Ortlan, Lynn Phillips, Katie White and Mollie Womble.

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*; Eve Davis, *advertising manager*; Ruth Anderson, Michael Benfield, Jennifer Garden, Kelli McElhaney, 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*; Tammy Sheldon, *editorial assistants*; and Mary Brown, *secretary*.

Distribution/circulation: William Austin, *manager*.

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

## Tar Heel Forum

### McNamara: shattering SDI fantasy

Leonard Wolfenstein

Guest Writer

Although Reagan and Gorbachev left without an agreement, the Iceland Summit was a remarkable event. The most important thing we learned from the Iceland Summit was that simply getting the two leaders together for a weekend could lead to historic breakthroughs.

This one weekend certainly achieved more than the previous six years of negotiations in Geneva. But the failure of the talks over the role of the Strategic Defense Initiative should cause all of us to examine not only SDI, but also what sort of arms reduction we can realistically expect.

Last week, in a pair of impressive lectures at Duke University, Robert McNamara addressed these crucial issues. McNamara's credentials are impeccable. He was secretary of defense under both Kennedy and Johnson. He is a hard-nosed realist who knows what it's like to be in the trenches.

Three times during his tenure as secretary of defense, the use of nuclear weapons was considered: Berlin in 1961, Cuba in 1962 and the Middle East in 1967. Since retiring from the World Bank, McNamara has devoted considerable time to studying and working on arms control. When he speaks to the public, he demystifies issues, stripping them to their essentials. McNamara does not simply criticize, but proposes constructive steps we can take to reduce the risk of nuclear war.

First and foremost, McNamara stressed that no human being has ever conceived of a beneficial use of nuclear weapons. Their only military value is to deter the other side from initiating a nuclear attack. He discounts their value as a deterrent against conventional attack as more and more European leaders are publicly stating that they oppose the use of nuclear weapons because such a response would destroy the cities they were designed to protect.

Our ultimate goal, then, should be mutual deterrence at the lowest levels of weapons necessary for stability. McNamara clearly explains why living in a world with no nuclear weapons is a luxury we don't have.

Such a world would in fact be very unstable, because the incentive for both sides to secretly build and stockpile a number of weapons would be enormous.

However, we could reduce the number of weapons from the 50,000 we have now to about 1,000. Such a reduction may be the most we can hope for. Policing a small nuclear arsenal is technologically feasible, and our technology is advancing every day.

In contrast to this, Reagan keeps talking about a world without nuclear weapons. In his first "Star Wars" speech on March 23, 1983, Reagan advanced the idea that a space-based defense could provide a perfect shield against nuclear attack, thus obviating the need for nuclear weapons. It is a fine idea; unfortunately, it is just a dream.

It is absolutely essential to understand from the outset that the entire scientific community considers this perfect shield technologically infeasible. What we are working on now, and for what Congress appropriated \$3.5 billion last week, is the initial research stage of a leaky shield. We already know how to shoot down a missile and, with this new technology, we may someday be able to shoot down a lot more, but we will never get anywhere close to a perfect shield.

Even building the leaky shield will require major technological breakthroughs on the order of 10 Manhattan Projects. For instance, our information-processing technology will have to be increased by a factor of 10. The leaky shield is estimated to cost at least \$1 trillion.

Furthermore, it is not clear what role this leaky shield could play in a stable nuclear world. Any defensive system can easily and cheaply be overwhelmed by more missiles. So if we pursue SDI without arms control agreements, the arms race will escalate

dramatically. On the other hand, if we had our leaky shield deployed against vastly reduced numbers of nuclear missiles, the Soviets would feel at a disadvantage. That is why Gorbachev insisted that SDI be included in any agreement on arms reductions.

The proposals for arms reductions that both sides agreed to at Reykjavik were extremely promising. That such a short meeting should nearly produce a historic agreement is remarkable. Yet, the manner of the meeting's conduct did not seem quite proper. Surely these critical issues should not be decided in an all-night poker session. So I am not disappointed that no agreement was signed.

The value of the meeting was twofold. First, it made the world aware that we need not accept each side's current massive nuclear arsenals, but that we aim for drastic arms reductions simply by getting the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union in the same room. Second, the collapse of the talks over SDI will force us to examine intently its purpose and prospects.

I have to agree with McNamara when he predicts that the true exposure of the cost of SDI will eventually stop it. By spending his time explaining nuclear issues in an objective, coherent and, most importantly, understandable manner, McNamara is performing a tremendous public service. His lectures were based on a recently released book, from which Time magazine published excerpts. The book should be required reading for all of us.

Ultimately, McNamara's message is one of hope, because he sees ways to get out of the nuclear mess. Despite the collapse of the Iceland talks, I see a lot of hope in the outcome. The fantasy of an effective defensive shield against nuclear weapons cannot long stand in the way of the reality of dismantling those weapons.

Leonard Wolfenstein is a graduate student in city and regional planning from Pittsburgh, Pa.

### Lottery lunacy

To the editor:

In light of the Department of Housing's latest installment in a long list of subversive decisions, one must wonder about the ardent claims that the Residence Hall Association and Housing work together for the good of the students. From all sides, it appears that Housing's intentions do not lie with the students' best interests, but with the quickest and most surreptitious methods of implementing unpublicized proposals.

The plan to guarantee housing for rising sophomores raises pertinent questions about Housing's motivations. A great deal of the problems generated by the University's new alcohol policy and how it is being implemented in the dorms would not exist if most students are underage to begin with. No more nasty little liability release forms to worry about, right, Director Kuncel? The easy way out has never been taken this quickly.

Granted, the accommodations on this campus are mind-boggling in superiority to the alternatives, but are we really to believe that rising sophomores are so inept that they cannot cope with lottery and the possibility of having to live off-campus? Surely the "intricacies" of finding a place to live can be muddled through by even the most average student.

In fact, Housing seems to be debilitating itself. The greater diversity and "richness of residence hall life" that the department has been clamoring for would surely be undermined by the disparity in the proportion of freshmen and sophomores to juniors and seniors. Dorm government would certainly feel the effects of this proposal. Without the experience and input of upperclassmen, our dormitories would represent only a part of the University.

Before any more moves are made to guarantee housing for sophomores, perhaps Kuncel and his associates should consider finding out how the students who are going to be affected by this kind of proposal feel. But then again, in retrospect perhaps, we should thank Kuncel and Housing for coming to the aid for our misguided and immature sophomores. With these combatants on their side, how can they lose?

KIM M. THORE  
 Junior  
 English

### Get primeval

To the editor:

What has become of this great campus? Have students been enlisted into the ranks of the now-deceased. Famous party towns of Sodom and Gomorrah? While this school's party atmosphere hasn't been totally destroyed by the wrath



of the Reagan administration, some of us still have our pride. Whose bright idea was it to attempt to subject UNC students to the kind of crap like the Union Bash? For all of the Carolina pride-filled individuals, going to a "bash" like this would be humiliating.

According to Alex Dickey, director of the Union Social Committee. "This bash is designed to appeal to the kid in all of us who just wants to have fun" ("All-campus bash to feature bands," Oct. 9). Get with it, Dickey! No self-respecting Carolina student would want to do something that appeals to the kid in us. We want something that appeals to the primordial beast that dwells in all of us. Who the hell wants to play in a Twister tournament, jump on a pogo stick or eat pies from 8 p.m. to 1 a.m. on a Thursday? What's next, a Care Bears movie festival?

For many years, this school has been known as "the Beer-drinking Capital of the World" and a party town — not the pogo and pie-guy city! At our ages, we want activities that appeal to the adult or the crazed post-adolescent that is in all of us.

Pull your head out of the sand. Get out of the milk-and-cookies syndrome. Why don't you save some of that cash you're foolishly wasting and sign up a real band to come here and play? Give us something besides a cheap BYOB festival where we'd be forced to listen to bands that the nerds of UVa. praise, while being surrounded by underage geeks who frequently go to these parties hoping that someone will slip them a cold Bud.

The kid in all of us should be let loose again after adulthood has been truly experienced, or at least until after the sardity of post-adolescence is cured. This bash is just another example of the treacherous hacks in student

government wasting money. Use those funds in a better and more memorable way. Think about it, director of the Union Social Committee.

MARK GOOD  
 Senior

### Total freedom

To the editor:

"Without freedom there can be no university." — Frank Porter Graham (bottom quote, Oct. 10). What did he mean? Freedom to do what? To think? What is freedom of thought? Was Graham an existentialist who believed that man should be his own maker, not God or society?

Perhaps Graham had a different idea in mind. Perhaps he meant that in communist societies there can be no universities; of course, there are universities in communist societies. Maybe he means that no true university can exist without true freedom. In which case there are no universities.

It seems to me that Graham does not really mean anything at all. Its just that "freedom" and "university" both seem like nice words and, like all nice words, they must go together.

A friend of mine is an anti-communist and happens to dislike onions and vegetables in general. It is his belief that onions are communist and meat is morally superior to vegetables. You think this is ridiculous. At least this nut does not lead us.

Who cares about Frank Porter Graham, anyway? What really matters is freedom. I don't mean freedom from communism but freedom from the system. How I would like to be free from everything, free from the preachers, free from Reagan's grotesque insanity, free from Rambo, free from junk food, free from television, free from myself.

Free from myself? Yes, free from myself because I am not

myself but someone else. Who? Reagan. I am Reagan because everytime I see Reagan I hate him as much as he hates me and I become like him. I become like the Pit preachers who indulge in an orgy of hatred.

It's funny how on the back page one reads the same arguments, or lack of arguments, day after day concerning the same issues. If we are all free in this wonderful dreamland, how come we all think the same? How come we all vote the same? How come there aren't any anarchist graffiti on campus?

JUAN ANTONIO OSUNA  
 Senior  
 Philosophy

### Drinking rights

To the editor:

I'd like to share my point of view about the "problem" of tail-gating at football games. To begin with, football is a festive, social event where fans come together to have a good time watching and supporting their team. Normally at social events people have the choice should they want to consume alcoholic beverages.

Therefore, it seems logical to me that we should have the prerogative to drink at football games. Ours is not a socialist society, we have the right to make responsible choices in regard to our own behavior. Those who do not wish to partake of the fruits of the vine, fine. But, please respect the rights of the silent majority, and do not try to conform society to your own wishes.

I, for one, am tired of hearing from this minority of righteous fanatics who are using our fine newspapers as their pulpits. Please live your own lives, and let others do so too!

J.K. MCGROOTER  
 Junior  
 Speech Communications