

the daily Collegian 15¢

Monday, Nov. 3, 1980
Vol. 81, No. 71 16 pages University Park, Pa. 16802
Published by Students of The Pennsylvania State University

Iran approves terms of hostage release

Difficulties still remain

By The Associated Press

The Iranian Parliament, in a major step toward ending a stalemate that has kept the world in crisis for a year, voted yesterday to free the 52 American hostages if the United States meets four conditions set down by Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini and a parliamentary committee.

Sadegh Ghotbzadeh, Iran's former foreign minister and a key figure in the U.S.-Iranian confrontation, said it was "physically impossible" for the Americans to be freed by tomorrow, Election Day, but said he hoped "the whole thing" could be over in one week.

It was the most promising development in the U.S.-Iranian confrontation in the 365 days since the seizure of the U.S. Embassy in Tehran. Still, the Iranian proposal, calling for U.S. concessions on complex financial matters, was fraught with potential difficulties.

President Carter, at a White House news briefing, said the Parliament's terms "appear to offer a positive basis" for negotiating the hostages' freedom, but he could not predict when that might come.

The Iranians said the United States must fulfill all of the terms — not simply signal its acceptance of them. Groups of hostages then would be freed in phases as each condition is met, they said.

The Parliament appeared to have hardened in at least one key aspect of the position set down by Khomeini when he listed the conditions.

Tehran radio said the Parliament's position was that "America's procrastination can prevent their release and lead to their trial (as alleged spies)."

Although the language approved by the Majlis does not mention trials, it does say the hostages would be turned over to the "judicial system" if the conditions were not met. When Khomeini first set down the conditions Sept. 12, U.S. officials were encouraged by the omission of any reference to trials.

American officials yesterday declined comment on the Parliament's refine-

ment, saying they were awaiting an official translation of the conditions.

The Iranian news agency, Pars, said the Parliament, with 200 of its 228 members present for the stormy session, voted by a "decisive majority" to approve the four conditions for the hostages' release recommended by a seven-member select committee. The action had been expected for the past week.

According to an unofficial Pars translation of the committee report, Iran is demanding that the United States:

- Make a "firm commitment to avoid all direct or indirect political and military interference" in Iran's affairs.

- Release an estimated \$8 billion in Iranian government assets in U.S. banks that were frozen by Carter's executive order last Nov. 14.

- "Cancel and annul" all financial claims against the Iranian government in U.S. courts. It says the U.S. government must guarantee that it, not Iran, will pay any damages awarded in such lawsuits.

- "Officially recognize the right of the Iranian government to the deceased shah's wealth and that of his close relatives."

Iran also demands that the U.S. president "take all legal and administrative actions necessary to transfer these properties to Iran."

The decision of the Parliament was announced as Iran struggled into the seventh week of war with neighboring Iraq.

Radio Tehran yesterday confirmed a report that Iraqi forces had capture Iranian Oil Minister Mohammed Jawad Baqir Tunguyan, a deputy minister and four other Iranian officials near the besieged Iranian oil refinery city Abadan.

The officials were "kidnapped contrary to international regulations," the broadcast said.

Iraq announced it had begun a major offensive to capture Abadan, which it claims to have surrounded.



As Carter administration officials warned there was "no basis" to expect that the American hostages would be released by Election Day — the one-year anniversary of the hostages' captivity — 6-year-old Suzanne Chase of Salem, Ore., tied a yellow ribbon 'round an old oak tree yesterday to commemorate the anniversary.

Carter responds to plan

WASHINGTON (UPI) — President Carter, responding to Iran's conditions for the release of the American hostages, told the nation yesterday he would accept only an arrangement that "preserves the national honor and national integrity."

Hastening back to the White House from the campaign trail for a day of conferences on the latest developments in the year-long crisis, Carter made a brief nationally televised television appearance.

He said the four-part Iranian proposal for the 52 hostages' freedom "appears to offer a positive basis" for achieving his long-stated objective — "the honor and vital interests of the United States and the earliest possible safe return of the hostages."

He said the administration was following up the Iranian offer through diplomatic channels, but asserted any U.S. action "will be in full accord with our laws and our Constitution."

Noting the chance for the hostages' freedom came only two days before the election, Carter pledged, "My decision on this matter will not be affected by the calendar."

He said the administration was keeping the congressional leadership, Republican presidential candidate Ronald Reagan, and independent John B. Anderson up to date on developments and, "We will keep the American people informed."

Carter said whether the hostages are freed before or after tomorrow's election, the Iranian government and all other nations "will find the American people united in wanting their return only on a basis that preserves the national honor and national integrity."

White House press secretary Jody Powell warned earlier there was "no basis" to expect the hostages, now one day short of one year in captivity, would be free before Election Day.

Carter and his advisers moved to dampen hopes the hostages' release was imminent because the Iranians' conditions, particularly the return of the late

shah's personal fortune and the unfreezing of an estimated \$8 billion in U.S. banks, posed what Secretary of State Edmund S. Muskie termed "complex" and time-consuming problems of American law.

Muskie said the U.S. decision on Iran's four conditions for releasing the hostages will not be made "until we understand the fine print."

Muskie earlier said in a television interview the United States was not ready to accept "just any proposition" to free the hostages and would be guided by the principles of American interests, honor, and the desire to free the hostages as soon as possible.

Powell, making the same point as the president and Muskie, told reporters after the second top-level session, "No one should for a moment labor under the misapprehension that the timing of the American elections will in any way affect the decisions of the American government."

Carter conferred with his chief foreign policy adviser the first time around. White House legal counsel Lloyd Cutler and Treasury Secretary William Miller joined the afternoon session, apparently to advise Carter on his options on Iran's demand that its assets in U.S. banks be freed.

Muskie, appearing on ABC's "Issues and Answers," said the four conditions announced by Iran's parliament appeared within the framework of terms outlined by Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini on Sept. 12. But, he added, "Until we understand the fine print, we won't know the limits."

If legal claims already have been attached to the Iranian assets frozen by Carter, Muskie said, that could be a problem. Suits which approximately equal the initial values of the frozen Iranian assets — about \$8 billion — have been filed in federal courts.

Another possible problem, Muskie said, is Iran's insistence the government guarantee Iran immunity against all legal claims.

Democratic committee alters its position and endorses Day

By JUSTIN CATANOSO

Daily Collegian Staff Writer

The State College Borough Democratic Committee has reversed its position and endorsed independent candidate Michael G. Day for the 77th District state legislative seat, committee chairman Gregory J. Stewart announced yesterday.

Although the committee said this summer it could not endorse Day because of party bylaws, Stewart said the bylaws were re-evaluated and found to be unclear when dealing with a party candidate without the support of the committee.

Robert C. Brazill, who won the Democratic primary on a write-in vote, lost the party's support when party officials discovered that he lived and voted in New Jersey three years ago. The Pennsylvania Constitution says a representative must live in the state for four consecutive years.

"They are presuming I am ineligible," Brazill said, "but that has not been proven."

In supporting Day, a registered Democrat who joined the race as an independent after the primaries, Stewart said, "It is clear that Mike Day represents the obvious and responsible alternative to the incumbent state representative. He is the only candidate in this race representing fundamental Democratic principles. He is a Democrat and always has been."

Stewart said he contacted 18 of the committee's 22 members this weekend and everyone reached indicated his or her support for Day.

Brazill charged that the committee was trying to "muscle me out of the election" and that its endorsement of Day was against party bylaws.

Saying that the committee reneged on its previous pledge not to support anyone other than a Democratic candidate, Brazill said, "I think Greg Stewart, his committee and Michael Day are guilty of election fraud and there's a strong possibility legal action. I'm looking into that now."

Stewart denied any intentions of fraud.

"Mr. Brazill has a lot to learn about politics," Stewart said. "The party can endorse anyone it wishes. It has nothing to do with fraud."

Executive Democratic committee



Michael G. Day

member Gary Potter said, "The party makes its own rules. And we're the party. If there was absolutely no question about Brazill's eligibility, we'd have no choice but to support him. But as far as we're concerned, we don't have a candidate."

Both Potter and Stewart said their endorsement was bolstered by a similar case in Philadelphia.

The Democratic committee from the 3rd District recently endorsed the independent opponent of Democratic incumbent Michael D. "Ozzie" Meyers for U.S. Congress. Meyers was expelled from the House last month after his conviction in the Abscam investigation.

"If the state Democratic Party ever tried to challenge our decision," Potter said, "they'd have a much larger committee in Philadelphia to contend with first."

Stewart said the bylaws interpretations are "strictly committee decisions."

Brazill, however, insisted the committee's action is illegal.

"By promoting a candidate who is not the party nominee, they are bypassing the primary system, bypassing the law and bypassing the mandate of the people," he said.

Day, on the other hand, called the endorsement "great."

"I can't say it comes as a surprise," he said. "The Democratic Party has been helping me out all along. It seems they are now willing to make their support open and let the voters know this."

Day said the committee, formerly discreet in its support, has supplied him with voter registration lists, addresses for fund-raising purposes and has helped his campaign workers deliver campaign literature.

"The endorsement will serve to remind people they don't have to vote Democrat in order to register a vote against Gregg Cunningham," Day said.

Senate won't endorse candidate

Three contenders for 77th District seat address USG

By DAVID MEDZERIAN

Daily Collegian Staff Writer

A divided Undergraduate Student Government Senate voted yesterday not to endorse a candidate for state representative from the 77th District, but several senators voiced their support for independent candidate Michael G. Day.

Voting on the issue came after the three candidates for the office spoke to the senate.

The approved bill, introduced by senators Mark Featherstone and Doug Crispell, gave the senators the option of voicing preference for either Day, Republican incumbent Rep. Gregg L. Cunningham or Democrat Robert C. Brazill. The final ballot gave 12 votes to Day and zero votes to both Brazill and Cunningham, with eight abstentions.

"This is not an endorsement," Crispell said. "This is a good way of letting it be known what we think."

Crispell's and Featherstone's bill was the third bill considered by the senate, but most discussion on each of the bills centered on whether the senate should make an endorsement at all.

Town senators Bill Cluck and Linda Anne Coxen introduced the bill that would have endorsed Day.

"It's about time student government came out with an endorsement for a candidate," Coxen said. "By doing this, it will show the students we are progressive and we are leaders."

But not all senators agreed with Coxen. Fraternity senator John Bravacos said that because of the differences between the candidates, some students would be angry if the senate made an endorsement.

"I don't think our choice is going to come out that good," he said. "No matter who we endorse, we're going to come up with

some bad feelings either way."

The bill to endorse Day was defeated by a 10-9 vote with one abstention — that of Day supporter Cindy Dutt, who said it is not right for the senate as a body to endorse a candidate if the group is divided.

"What we are doing now hasn't been done before, and I don't think we should start now," Dutt said. "I would like to support Day, but I don't think the senate should endorse him."

The first bill on the matter, introduced by town senator Vic Dupuis and defeated by a vote of 12-7 with two abstentions, said the senate should make no endorsement. Dupuis said the senate might experience problems if it endorses a candidate.

"For us as a representative body to go and tell our constituents that we want them to vote in one direction or another, we might be committing ourselves to a political philosophy we might not want to," he said. "It's not our responsibility."

Centre Halls senator Ed Dougherty said the senate had waited until too late to make an effective endorsement.

"This is too last-minute to do any kind of credible job," he said. "We should have started at least three weeks ago."

But town senator Bill Cluck said the senators as student leaders should express their opinion on the rate.

"We are probably potentially more informed," he said. "They might like to know what their elected officials think."

Town senator Ellie Sternberg agreed with Cluck, saying, "I think it is our right and our duty as student leaders to tell them how we see it."

"I think we should be very much involved in state government," she said. "What we are here for is to make an impact on the future for the students. I think it is very important for us to let the students know what we think."

Bong ban for minors on agenda

By LORRAINE ORLANDI

Daily Collegian Staff Writer

The State College Municipal Council tonight is to consider a proposed ordinance that would ban the sale of drug paraphernalia to minors.

The council also is to consider a resolution that would open more council meetings and discussions to the public, and a recommendation to the state Department of Transportation on completion of the State College bypass.

The ordinance banning the sale of drug paraphernalia to minors was proposed by council member Daniel Chaffee in July as an alternative to a total ban.

At its October meeting the council adopted the total ban — the "bong law" — but also asked municipal solicitor Robert K. Kistler to draft Chaffee's proposal for the council's consideration. Kistler said the ban to minors could be adopted in addition to the bong law.

The bong law makes it illegal to sell items for use, designed for use or intended for use with illegal drugs.

Many items considered drug paraphernalia also have legal uses; therefore, conviction under the bong law requires that the person selling an item

know that it is being bought for use with illegal drugs.

The proposed ban to minors would make it illegal to sell paraphernalia to minors, regardless of intent.

Chaffee said in October that he thought the ban to minors would be enforceable and effective because it eliminates the need to know the intent of the purchaser.

The open meetings resolution, proposed by council member Joseph Wakeley Jr., would open more council meetings to the public, as well as meetings of council's committees, authorities, boards and commissions.

Under the state Open Meetings Law, or the "Sunshine Act," meetings of government agencies are required to be open when formal action such as voting or policy-setting is taking place.

Wakeley said in September he believes the public has a right to see the discussion that goes into a decision before the decision is made. His resolution provides for private discussion regarding litigation, personnel problems and purchase price of real estate. The Sunshine Act also provides for closed meetings under these

circumstances.

The council's recommendation on the State College bypass is one of several being received by PennDOT regarding completion of the two-mile section of the 10-mile bypass.

Alternatives for completion include using a two-lane highway or a four-lane highway. PennDOT officials have said the two-lane highway, which is \$3 million cheaper than the four-lane highway, would handle traffic adequately.

PennDOT is seeking federal funds for the project. After a public hearing on the bypass Nov. 19, PennDOT will make a recommendation for completion to the federal highway administration.

Decent start

There should be a good deal of sunshine today and after a chilly start, it will become breezy and milder. The afternoon high will reach 57. Partly cloudy and windy tonight with a low of 40. Election Day weather should feature partly sunny, windy and mild conditions with a shower possible. The afternoon temperatures will be in the upper 50s.