

Editorial

South Africa needs stronger sanctions

When Congress considers the possibility of stronger sanctions against South Africa in the forthcoming weeks, it should not only reaffirm the largely symbolic sanctions already in place, but also implement new, tougher sanctions to facilitate democratic reforms and an end to apartheid, South Africa's system of racial oppression.

But President Reagan is likely to veto any legislation calling for tougher sanctions that reaches his desk, arguing that sanctions will hurt blacks and exclude diplomacy from the negotiating process.

The Reagan administration's argument, however, has two fallacious assumptions: that sanctions and diplomacy are incompatible and that sanctions will hurt blacks more than help them.

Rather than undercut diplomacy, comprehensive sanctions will force South African President P.W. Botha and his administration to the negotiating table by weakening the economy in the long run. The Botha Administration will continue to shun negotiating an end to apartheid until sanctions and other factors — such as boycotts, labor strikes and internal violence — weaken the authoritarian regime.

In assuming sanctions will hurt black South Africans, the administration is correct — but only with regard to the short run.

In the long run, however, sanctions will benefit considerably black South Africans in terms of political freedom, and such benefits will outweigh the short run costs to the black population. Stronger sanctions also will hurt affluent whites more than the relatively poor blacks.

Because foreign trade and investment is largely concentrated in capital-intensive industries, sanctions or divestment or both are likely to affect negatively the white, professional work force proportionately more than unskilled blacks.

Moreover, affluent whites have more to lose in terms of living standards than their segregated and exploited black counterparts.

Nevertheless, South African blacks not only have pledged to accept short-run economic hardships for the political purpose of abolishing apartheid, but also have called for Western nations to impose sanctions. The black trade union movement, for example, has endorsed Western sanctions even though such measures would adversely affect unemployment.

Furthermore, front-line states that are significantly dependent on South Africa, such as Zimbabwe, have called for comprehensive Western sanctions even though it will damage their own economic interests. Zimbabwe, a nation that exports about 90 percent of its international trade through South Africa, has demanded that Western nations impose sanctions against its powerful neighbor despite probable economic retaliation from the Botha administration.

In order to end apartheid, Congress should implement substantive sanctions against South Africa's most strategic and economically important imports, such as advanced technology and oil, crucial ingredients for Botha's military machine.

As South Africa is heavily dependent on foreign trade and capital inputs from abroad, comprehensive U.S.-led Western sanctions are the most viable measure — and perhaps the only alternative to direct military involvement — to halt racial oppression in South Africa.



Letters

Hearsay

Dean Holland made several excellent points in his recent comments regarding Judge Bork's confirmation, especially concerning the disinformation of America.

Though never a big fan of Judge Bork, I was nonetheless shocked when I returned to law school this fall and noticed the unquestioning anti-Bork opinions adopted by so many.

A lawyer is supposed to master the facts of his or her case; yet, from students and faculty alike I have heard and read so many bald assertions, gut reactions, insinuations, and conclusory statements about Judge Bork that I now wonder whether many people here have taken the time to independently learn details about Bork, or whether, instead, most aren't simply parroting each others' hearsay.

The law school is but a microcosm. People in general don't or won't take the time to learn about Judge Bork. They start form a state of being uninformed.

Then Judge Bork's critics come along with fear-provoking assertions that portray Bork as a

threat to whatever their interests may be. Negative news is powerful stuff, and people latch onto the assertions as though they were facts. Suddenly as that, the uninformed become the disinformed, and they pass the word on.

Case in point: Senator Kennedy makes condemning assertions that Judge Bork is against individual rights. Disturbing and powerful, this drivel is mainlined through the media to our psyches.

Half-digested, such assertions are regurgitated in recent faculty and student letters. "Judge Bork's philosophy is one of complete hostility to individual rights," rumor has it.

Yet in *Ollman v. Evans*, Judge Bork writes, "The important thing, the ultimate consideration, is the constitutional freedom that is given into our keeping." It is a judge's duty, Bork adds, to see new threats to our freedoms and thus to ensure that our freedoms "are made effective in today's circumstance."

Robert John
2nd year law

Preservation

The proposed Riverfront Research Park places the University and the State Board of Higher Education in the posi-

tion of promoting a 72-acre private development scheme that benefits a few development interests at the expense of public resources.

The traditional attitude of using University property for student needs has been swept away, despite concerns expressed by student groups and individuals about the location of this development, and despite the overwhelming student mandate in a campus ballot measure last spring.

The proposed master plan ignores the student position that the soccer field should be preserved in its present location.

While the location provides an aesthetic and functional relationship with the adjacent footbridge, bike path and swimming area, the new plan cuts off the field from direct access to the bridge and swimming site, and squeezes the field between two research office buildings. It is unlikely that the present uses of the field for sports events can be compatible with a quiet office environment.

Furthermore, the new master plan is inconsistent with the University's prior plans for this area, plans that called for the expansion of recreational fields along the river. Nor is the master plan consistent with the state goal of preserving the Willamette greenway.

Despite these obvious problems of incompatibility, the project proposers have ignored the many appropriate alternative sites including the downtown area, and expanding the West Eugene area.

Unfortunately, the City Council, University and private developers seem determined to squeeze the maximum gross national product out of the riverfront area.

Students such as myself are concerned that a few development interests are taking the public for a ride at the expense of a beautiful and irreplaceable natural resource, the Willamette greenway.

Dan Stotter
Law

Thursday, October 8, 1987

Oregon Daily Emerald

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published Monday through Friday except during exam week and vacations by the Oregon Daily Emerald Publishing Co., at the University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon, 97403.

The Emerald operates independently of the University with offices on the third floor of the Erb Memorial Union and is a member of the Associated Press.

The Emerald is private property. The unlawful removal or use of papers is prosecutable by law.

General Staff
Advertising Director: Susan Thelen
Production Manager: Michele Ross
Classified Manager: Kelli Mason
Assistant to the Publisher: Jean Ownbey

Advertising Sales: Teri Boring, Gary DeLossa, Tom Leech, Catherine Lijja, Rick Martz, Laura McKinney, Heather Mull, Joann Nelson, Julie Paul, Barbara Rogers, Scott Thorkildson, Joan Wildermuth

News and Editorial
Display Advertising and Business: 686-5511
Classified Advertising: 686-3712
Letter Perfect Graphics: 686-4343
Production: 686-5511
Circulation: 686-4381

Editor: Stanley Nelson
Managing Editor: Scott Maben
News Editor: Eden Godbey
Editorial Page Editors: Angela Muniz/Steven Hoenisch
Sports Editor: Aaron Knox
Photo Editor: Shu-Shing Chen
Graphic Design Editor: Lorraine Rath
Special Issues Editor: Kelly Kortekaas
Entertainment/Sports Segment Editor: H.C. Hutto
Night Editor: Stephen Maher

Associate Editors
Community: Stephen Maher
Higher Education/Administration: Michael Drummond
Student Government/Activities: Carolyn Lamberson
General Assignment/Entertainment: Will Holbert

Reporters: Craig Harris, Gary Henley, Andrew LaMar, Jeff Morgan, Ingrid Petersen, Cami Swanson, Kelvin Wee

Photographers: Sherlyn Bjorkgren, Maria Corvallis, Andy Cripe, Dusty Etzel, Derrel Hewitt, John Giustina, Bobbie Lo, Ross Martin, Andre Ranieri, Dan Wheeler, Michael Wilhelm

Production: Sandra Daller / Ad Coordinator
Kelly Alexandra, Ronwin Nicole Ashton, Virginia Baniaga, Stephanie Drynan, Dolores Ferreo, Shannon Gaiter, Lisa Haggerty, Stephanie Holland, Dierdre Kelly, Elliot Knight, Jung Lee, Bobbie Lo, James Mason, Angie Muniz, Ted Shepler, Lisa Svanevik, Ingrid White, Kelli Williams, Serena Williams, X. Kang Xie