

NUCLEAR FREEZE

Debate over arms race heightens during Ground Zero Week

By MARK LANGSTON

The current debate on nuclear weapons has reached an intensity not seen since the 1964 elections. After living through the 1970s fairly quietly, the world has suddenly taken a massive interest in who owns what and how many of the various forms of nuclear weapons. Not surprisingly, after this long dormancy of opinion, the thoughts on the issue that have sprung forth are quite varied. Unfortunately, many of them are also quite uninformed. Others lay shrouded in a midst of rhetoric, idealism and illogic. The debate has become clouded as a result.

Throughout the debate, a number of basic assumptions has been adopted by many people without proper consideration. What has resulted from these assumptions is that many of the suggestions for resolving the nuclear arms race have been the product of dangerously narrow-minded thinking. It is important that everyone understand the rationale behind these assumptions if debate on this most delicate issue is to remain as clear as possible.

The first major assumption has been that once adopted, a nuclear freeze will be honored by all participants. This notion is nothing but wishful thinking. If the nations could trust each other to adhere to the freeze, it is quite likely that their differences would never have led to an arms race to begin with. And as for verification, a U.N. inspection team will see only what it is shown. Even the sophisticated spy satellites over us — reputed to be able to detect when Chairman Brezhnev's reading lamp is on — cannot find bombs stockpiled underground or mobile ICBMs hidden in a structure as inconspicuous as a barn. A nuclear freeze is therefore likely to be unenforceable.

A second underlying assumption made in the debate over the freeze proposal has been that the major differences between the United States and the Soviet Union can be settled successfully by peaceful negotiations. It is further assumed that the conflict and tensions existing between the two powers are basically caused by mistrust and jealousy, matters that can be worked out if both sides will show good faith. Few things are further from the truth.

The conflict between the United States and the U.S.S.R. is one of viciously contrasting ideologies, or two diametrically opposite systems of life that are, in the long run, mutually exclusive. Unless one side corrupts its beliefs noticeably, continued conflict is inevitable. This is not to say that a nuclear arms freeze is impossible or necessarily undesirable, merely that to expect it to in any way alleviate the basic tensions between the two powers is foolhardy.

A third major assumption is probably the most controversial, namely that the United States and the Soviet Union are roughly equal in military power. While such may be true of a full-scale nuclear war in which both powers attack with no holds barred, it is not true in a limited European scale.

Newsweek columnist George F. Will recently wrote that "Applied to medium-range missiles in Europe," which are strategically the most valuable weapons in that theater, "the immediate-freeze proposal is Brezhnev's negotiating position: U.S.S.R. 300, U.S. 0. A general freeze at current levels would leave no incentive for the Soviets to negotiate ... substantial reductions ..." To adopt a nuclear freeze at this time, then, would make any real kind of effective arms control with the Soviet Union impossible.

A fourth assumption is undoubtedly the easiest to accept off-hand, but is the most dangerous assumption of them all. That assumption is that neither side can possibly win a nuclear war. And of course if both sides were to attack one another with their full arsenals, both would be devastated. But that is a very unlikely way for nuclear war to happen. Much more likely is that one side would use a variety of devices such as killer satellites, internal sabotage, radar-jamming tactical missiles, and radar-invisible aircraft to disguise an attack in the hopes of achieving a quick, pre-emptive strike on the other power's forces. This could be done with less trouble than the average person has been led to believe. The above camouflaging methods need only be effective for five to ten minutes, just long enough for a small number of submarines to launch an attack that would destroy every significant military, civilian, and communications target possessed by the other. Such a plan involves great risk, of course, but with every technological breakthrough involving the improvement of delivery systems and camouflaging techniques, nuclear war becomes less and less "unwinnable."

Eventually the day will come when one power feels it possesses the ability to destroy the other without fear of retaliation. To most Americans, any type of nuclear war is a loss for all humanity, but it must be remembered that different nations have different ideas as to what constitutes a nuclear victory.

The blind acceptance of these assumptions underlying the movement to initiate a nuclear arms freeze has threatened the clarity of thought needed to resolve such an issue. The United States should welcome discussion of the issue, but citizens should be wary of falling prey to these arguments based on fantasy. There is simply too much at stake here to be uninformed.

Mark Langston is a freshman from Greensboro.

By JONATHAN RICH

When the capitols of Europe erupted in mass demonstration against nuclear arms last fall, the Reagan administration was quick to criticize the Europeans for their "appeasement" in the face of Soviet aggression. Less than a year later, growing opposition from the previously loyal American citizenry is now forcing Reagan to reconsider his own nuclear arms program. With the advent of the second national Ground Zero Week, the American movement against nuclear arms has been definitively established.

This week over 500 communities and 350 colleges are participating in a nationwide campaign against the continuing development and deployment of nuclear weapons. Their ranks include Democrats and Republicans, numerous mayors, state officials and clergymen. The movement's popular support has already been reflected in the number of congressmen who now advocate a bilateral freeze on all nuclear weapons. Along with an increasing number of Americans across the nation, these representatives have finally recognized the strategic, economic and social imperatives for a moratorium on nuclear arms.

From a strategic or military point of view, there has never been a better time for a nuclear freeze. Contrary to what some alarmists in the Pentagon are prone to claim, the United States has maintained parity, if not superiority over the Soviet Union in the area of nuclear weapons. This opinion is held by the likes of such conservatives as Defense Secretary Casper Weinberger and Secretary of State Alexander Haig. It is also born out by America's established superiority in deliverable warheads (9,500 to 6,000), mobile missiles (on submarines and planes) and overall technology and accuracy. With only 200 bombs needed to devastate the Soviet Union's major cities and industries, this country has the capacity to kill every Soviet citizen several times over.

Despite such overkill capacities, President Reagan wishes to devote \$222 billion toward a major expansion of U.S. nuclear forces over the next six years. The implied purpose of this program — which would give us 17,000 more warheads and an array of new weapons — is to gain nuclear "superiority" over the Soviet Union. A major component for such a drive would be the ability to wage a "limited" nuclear war as well as an all-out attack.

The most dangerous element in such a program is the marked shift in emphasis from conceiving of nuclear weapons as deterrents to how they can be used as offensive weapons. As the Center for Defense Information has pointed out: "The U.S. public is being mistakenly led to believe that the continued expansion of our nuclear forces enhances deterrence. In fact, if it contributes to Soviet insecurities about the safety of their own nuclear retaliatory forces it may be doing just the opposite."

Due to ongoing technological advances, the United States has developed missile systems with the accuracy to destroy small hardened targets such as missile silos and command bunkers. By the end of this decade, such first-strike capability will be present in all legs of the land-air-sea defense triad in the form of MX and Cruise missiles and a new generation of submarine-launched weapons.

The deployment of these accurate missiles, capable of striking Soviet military targets within five minutes — as in the case of submarine launched missiles — will pose a definite threat to the Soviet Union, which would have little time to detect and respond to a U.S. attack. It would also spur the Soviet Union's efforts to achieve similar weapons systems, capable of destroying U.S. land-based missiles. The development and deployment of such weapons will thus contribute greatly to international instability and the chances of an inadvertent nuclear war.

A bilateral nuclear moratorium would halt Reagan's dangerous preparations for nuclear war as well as diminish the threats posed by continued technological advances in nuclear weaponry. It would assure both sides of a clear capacity for retaliation in the event of a nuclear strike, thereby maintaining the mutual deterrence that has preserved the peace.

Aside from military considerations, there are solid economic reasons for a nuclear freeze. Like every previous administration since World War II, the Reagan administration has stressed the economic benefits of defense spending, particularly its job-creating potential. Yet according to the Council on Economic Priorities, jobs created by the military are generally highly-skilled, concentrated in only a few geographic regions and are less numerous than the civilian alternatives created by the same expenditures.

A freeze on the development and deployment of nuclear weapons would constitute an important step toward reducing the astronomical proportions of the U.S. military budget. The \$1.6 trillion that Reagan has proposed to spend over the next five years will only destabilize our military and economic positions. Faced with even harsher realities, the Soviet Union has indicated a willingness to negotiate substantial arms reductions if not a nuclear moratorium. The United States should not miss this historic opportunity to work for peace rather than war and toward the advancement rather than destruction of our civilization.

Jonathan Rich, a junior history and political science major from Quogue, New York, is UNC coordinator for Ground Zero Week.



Nuclear freeze movement a simple one

By KEN MINGIS

Some say the world will end in fire,
Some say in ice.
From what I've tasted of desire
I hold with those who favor fire...
Robert Frost, *Fire and Ice*

Proponents of a proposed nuclear arms freeze fear much the same thing—that the world will end in fire, nuclear fire. That's why many Americans have finally stopped going about their everyday lives long enough to think about nuclear war and its consequences. What they see frightens them.

The nuclear freeze movement in the United States has been mushrooming during the past several months for one reason—it's a simple idea. Its supporters don't give a damn about the details, about how many missiles we'll trade for how many of their bombers. They just want it all stopped. It's a message everyone can understand.

The push for a freeze began in March 1981, when 18 cities in small, conservative Vermont passed resolutions calling on the United States to halt its nuclear arms build-up and begin negotiations with the

Soviet Union to do the same. Before long, cities and towns across the country were adopting similar resolutions. Sens. Edward Kennedy, D-Mass., and Mark Hatfield, R-Ore., introduced a nuclear freeze bill in the U.S. Senate. One week later a weaker version was introduced by Sens. Henry Jackson, D-Wash. and John Warner, R-Va. Anti-nuclear films were even shown in the House of Representatives. All had one thing in mind—coming to grips with the nuclear fear growing in America.

Ironically the freeze movement comes in part as a reaction to President Ronald Reagan and his strong rhetoric. Things have changed quickly since he was sworn in more than one year ago. This president talks of a "limited nuclear war." Combined with other tough talk and some of the largest defense spending ever, Reagan himself probably insured the success of the freeze movement. With every new presidential threat comes added support for the freeze.

Unlike past anti-nuke campaigns, this one enjoys widespread support among many groups of Americans. In the late 1950s and early 1960s the first stirrings of today's protests began with "Ban the Bomb" rallies. In those days, bomb shelters were the thing to have. If you didn't have one, you made close friends with

someone who did. But at the time, most people were unwilling to accept nuclear war as a possibility. They worried about money, taxes, children and their future. They did not worry about the bomb. It is a mentality that exists even today; no one really wants to contemplate a nasty war, at least not before now.

Supporters and opponents of the freeze both have valid points. Opponents feel that such a move would place the United

States permanently behind the Soviet Union in number of arms. They point out that verification of any freeze agreement would be next to impossible and doubt the Soviets would even go along with it in the first place.

Supporters simply say that it doesn't matter whether the United States is first or not. Both countries can destroy each other; the only solution is to stop making the bombs.



Minorities in Honor Court

By LARRY ELLIS

You are a male, age 20. You are charged with cheating on a Chemistry 11 exam. You are black. The Instrument of Student Judicial Governance states that you have the right to racial representation: at least three of the five members of the trial court shall not be of the majority race. Do you choose to exercise this right?

The 1982-83 Honor Court has focused on minority recruitment to meet the requirement of racial representation. From posters on South Campus to extend minority application deadlines, recruitment attempts appear to have succeeded. Eight of the 30 court members selected are minority students. Many people challenge the court's obligation to recruit minorities. Should the right to racial or sexual representation exist? Can the court serve its purpose without the representation clause?

The Honor Court functions "to give fair and impartial hearings to defendants," said Joe Doloboff, vice chairman of the 1981-82 court. Would a defendant receive an unfair trial if he or she were not judged by members of the same sex or race?

Court members are trained to regard only the evidence in deciding a verdict. Extensive preparation at a fall retreat, a certification exam on the instrument, and informal discussions throughout the year qualify court members to render impartial verdicts. Training at the fall retreat includes lectures and discussions on the standards by which decisions are reached, said Anne Bowden, assistant dean for student life and a judicial programs officer.

"We also have a simulated trial at which old court members observe and comment on new members," she said. "It (training) is thorough." Several court members agreed that in all of their cases, whether a special court had been requested or not, impartial verdicts had been rendered.

Even if every defendant is assured a fair trial, should not racial or sexual representation be an option to make the defendant as comfortable as possible? In keeping with the spirit of the tradition "innocent until proven guilty," should not the court overcompensate to protect the individual? The court should seek to accommodate the defendant. However, accommodation must be weighed against damages to the system.

To ensure racial or sexual representation, the governance instrument requires in its composition clause that at least eight members be of the majority race and eight of the minority, with at least 12 female and 12 male members. Jackie Jeffries, vice chairman of the 1982-83 court, fears possible misconceptions of court procedure among students. "White students may feel blacks have an easier chance to get on the court. But initial evaluation of applicants is blind to sex and race." Nonetheless, 1983 chairperson Elizabeth Ennen says, "If our blind admission policy fails to yield eight minorities, we may have to sacrifice equality for the quota."

Perhaps those most adversely affected by the composition clause are minority members of the court. Junior Al Perry was recruited for the 1981-82 court after the application deadline last year because too few qualified blacks had applied. "He (the recruiter) said they wanted the most qualified black applicants," Perry said. "What annoyed me was being sought as a black—not because I was qualified."

"He (the recruiter) said they wanted the most qualified black applicants. What annoyed me was being sought as a black—not because I was qualified."

Al Perry
Honor Court member

"If I had applied and been accepted under those conditions, I would not have felt good about myself. People might have thought the only reason I was on the court was because I am black—especially other court members."

Others contend that quotas perpetuate prejudices. Court members are all able to weigh evidence and to judge impartially. Whereas all court members are equally qualified, requesting a special court reinforces a false perception that such a court will conduct a fairer trial. This constitutes a pre-judgment of court members.

"There's so much diversity among the black population and among the white population," Doloboff said. "Trial by peers is important. We are all students facing similar pressures and concerns. We are all peers."

Lowered acceptance standards and a perpetuation of prejudice are each potential damages that outweigh accommodating the defendant and that suggest a need for a revision of the governance instrument. Yet is there no reason other than racial or sexual representation for seeking minority involvement on the court?

The new court in some ways serves an educational purpose for the University community. Broad awareness of the community is important to a body that seeks to uphold the standards of that community. Law school professor Robert Byrd, who has played a central role in revising the governance instrument over the last twenty years, said, "If minorities distrust the honor court and the honor code, then the clause may be very important." Byrd said he would like to see minority involvement in the court occur spontaneously.

Unfortunately, however, many minority students perceive the court to be closed to them. Many of the students interviewed did not know how to get involved with the court. Few knew what court membership entailed. The 1982-83 honor court is working to overcome these barriers. Recruiting efforts helped to secure 70 minority candidates, of whom seven were accepted in the color-blind admission process. Court members make presentations on the honor code to freshman English classes and frequently to large lecture classes.

Other avenues must also be explored. Residence hall officers and resident assistants might become involved in such presentations. All presentations might include information on the court and its responsibilities. Different minority populations should be approached. Even open question-and-answer sessions for students who are considering applying for the court might be held before selection.

Clearly any solution to the problem of minority membership on the honor court must aim toward self-generating involvement. Involvement sparks leadership which sparks change and growth of the system. But many barriers persist. Minorities are rarely part of the network that produces a court of 85 percent Greek membership. Information about the court is often limited to Greek groups, and such information is just now circulating in campus minority publications.

The problem is not a lack of interest, then, but of lack of information. "Per capita blacks applied as much as whites this year," Ennen said. That indicates just as much of an interest. It just needs to be tapped.

Larry Ellis is a junior philosophy major from Skillman, N.J.

Moscow or Kiev. Then it would be their turn again. You get the picture...

Scenarios such as these lie at the root of the nuclear arms freeze proposals. In the past, if a war were to occur, it was always assumed some life on Earth would remain. But with the increase in number and strength of weapons during the past few years, even this is now in doubt. Advocates of freeze ask "Are we ready to destroy mankind?" Nuclear war means you can forget exams, more money from home, mom and dad. For better or worse, whatever dreams and plans you had are over.

The debate over arms control and a freeze is likely to continue, its effects as a movement are impossible to predict. But what is important is that now, it is being discussed, argued, protested and explained. People are paying attention. If nothing else, supporters of the movement have accomplished that. Many Americans now realize that responsibility for nuclear war lies not only with one person, the president, but with everyone.

Think about it. Rather than fire perhaps it is time to hold with those who favor ice.

Ken Mingis, a junior journalism major from Raleigh, is associate editor of The Daily Tar Heel.