

# The Daily Tar Heel

91st year of editorial freedom

KERRY DEROGHI, Editor

EDDIE WOOTEN, Managing Editor

CHARLES ELLMAKER, Associate Editor FRANK BRUNI, Associate Editor

KELLY SIMMONS, University Editor

MICHAEL TOOLE, City Editor

KYLE MARSHALL, State and National Editor

KAREN FISHER, Features Editor

MICHAEL DESISTI, Sports Editor

JEFF GROVE, Arts Editor

MELISSA MOORE, News Editor

CHARLES W. LEDFORD, Photography Editor

## A costly symbol

1984 is an election year, so all those with aversions to lofty promises must either resign themselves to the impending barrage of good intentions or seek counseling. Candidates for each and every office will busy themselves with making the impossible seem suddenly and miraculously manageable.

President Reagan, however, has gone too far in his suspension of practicality in the name of winning public favor with his announced plans for a continuously manned space station.

What the president wants to accomplish within a decade is the establishment of a station in space with a central facility that would serve as living and working quarters for a crew of six to eight astronauts. From the space station, the crew would perform scientific experiments, collect astronomical data and take advantage of the weightlessness of space to manufacture such materials as drugs. Surrounding the crew's central facility would be unmanned modules with the scientific instruments without which the crew's work would be impossible.

To be sure, it's an awe-inspiring notion. But it's also wasteful and deceptive. A manned station in space would not so much stretch present technology as it would stretch the already overburdened federal budget. At a time when the federal deficit has grown to frightening proportions, a manned station in space is a luxury this nation cannot afford. Most all of the station's proposed functions would be better accomplished without man's presence. In fact, the vibrations from the crew might only disrupt the sensitive telescopes to be placed on the station. The station's estimated cost of \$8 billion would be reduced drastically by the absence of man. But so would the sentiment behind the station's presence.

And that is what Reagan is ultimately concerned about — the pride and patriotism evoked in Americans by the romantic image of men living and working in space. Speaking of the space station proposal in his State of the Union address last week, the president urged the nation to "reach for greatness again" and "follow our dreams to distant stars." He sounded much like the late John F. Kennedy, who established space as the New Frontier and attempted to redeem the American ego after Sputnik with a massive increase in funds for space research. Whether the fruits of that research were really worth the cost is seldom debated; what's remembered is the national pride that surrounded the effort.

Effective symbols can indeed be one of the most effective tools employed by the politician. So can deception. In making voters believe that a manned station in space would be an amazing technological advance and research opportunity, Reagan is constructing a deceptive symbol that could cost this nation a great deal of money better allocated to tangible improvements in the quality of life in the United States. Unfortunately, Reagan, the most histrionic of presidents and the most consummate of actors, is not always big on reality. And nothing encourages flights from truth more than an election year.

## Nuclear freeze a complex proposal

By ANDREA STUMPF

Even a cursory look at nuclear arms will indicate that a wariness of simple solutions is justified when evaluating the nuclear freeze option. Simple solutions tend to indicate dangerous oversimplification, and although a mutual, verifiable freeze could bring benefits, a number of detrimental aspects could follow as well. As a starting point, a complete freeze across the board in all areas of nuclear defense can serve as a gauge by which to evaluate positive and negative aspects. In using the extreme as a foil, the strategic viability of a partial freeze or of alternative arms control options can be considered.

Looking first at the good, there are five points that should be mentioned. The nuclear freeze proposal thus far has: Evoked and enlisted widespread public concern about nuclear potential; offered a plan for U.S. spending reductions of approximately \$18 billion per year; sought to capitalize on the present overall nuclear parity between the United States and the Soviet Union; provided a chance to forestall the addition of highly accurate and thus destabilizing nuclear weapons; been recognized as more easily verifiable than a complex agreement of a partial halt.

The picture, however, is incomplete without mention of a few concerns regarding a nuclear freeze. Motivation for the Soviets to engage in optimum reductions would be less ensured. The need for deterrence and war preparation would be unchanged because frozen forces would still have destructive potential. Replacement of unstable weapons systems with more stable systems would not be a part of the freeze negotiations. Modernization of systems that could improve stability would be precluded. And verification negotiations would be extremely difficult and time-consuming.

Being easily understood and accepted is first a good and then a bad aspect of the nuclear freeze concept. In our functional democracy, the idea of a freeze has provided the valuable services of raising the consciousness of Americans as well as providing a tangible handle by which to exhibit concern in a measurable manner. However, public support is in one regard illusory and in another obstructive. It is illusory in that the public choice of policy does not rest on a detailed understanding of present nuclear arsenals. Thus, the easily understandable nature of a nuclear freeze requires a cautious reading of public opinion. It is obstructive in that the

asymmetrical expression of public opinion — open in the West but not in the East — both threatens instability in the superpower square-off and raises the potential for an improved Soviet position in arms control negotiations.

Concern about nuclear arms rests not only on the potential dangers of destruction but also on the immediate dangers of reduced social priorities. Present spending on arms in the world is more than the total indebtedness of Third World countries. One thought is that in doling out guns and butter under a frozen arms race, more butter could be provided. But the reasoning can be erroneous unless assurances are made that defense spending will not simply be shifted from nuclear to conventional weaponry. Since a freeze does not remove the need for deterrence nor war-fighting capabilities, it only redefines the means for a strong defense. At present, NATO does not have sufficient conventional capabilities to balance the Soviets in conventional terms alone. The temptation with a nuclear freeze would be to increase spending on conventional arms.

While a nuclear freeze would hinder dangerous modernization of weaponry, it would also hinder strategic alterations that could be beneficial. A complete freeze would lock into place both the stabilities and the instabilities at that point in time. As destructive as each nuclear weapon can be, it is difficult to think in degrees of destructiveness. It should, however, be recognized that some nuclear systems are more dangerous and more destabilizing than others. The choice of missile type does make a difference in the level of defense security.

If maximizing stability means limiting the incentive for either side to strike first, then short-range missiles come out as more destabilizing than long-range missiles. The Pershing missiles presently being deployed in Europe are highly accurate first-strike missiles that undermine the stability of our systems. An immediate freeze could halt this deployment, but even if serious attempts at a treaty were begun today, negotiations for a freeze would extend beyond the scheduled completion of deployment. The introduction of MIRV also added instability, since single target capacity is more predictable than that of multiple targets per missile. Thus, single warheads, which are also less useful as first-strike weapons and more able to survive, would promote stability if they replaced MIRV warheads. However, a nuclear freeze would not include negotiations for such a stabilizing substitution of missiles.

Regardless of the desirability of any arms control agreements, consensus on the type of control is not even

half the battle. Even if the United States and the Soviet Union could commit themselves to a nuclear freeze, the difficulties of setting down the specifics of a treaty should not be underestimated. Verification negotiations were the most time-consuming part of the SALT II preparations.

Perhaps the single largest problem with the popular freeze proposal is its lack of flexibility. By pushing the freeze concept to the extreme, the possibility of implementing changes that improve the present strategic set-up are precluded. And active nuclear freeze proponents know well enough that it is easy to undercut the freeze idea by driving it to the maximum interpretation of a complete freeze.

Far more appropriate, and perhaps less difficult to negotiate, are limited changes, such as replacing MIRVed missiles with single warheads and banning anti-satellite weapons to the present defense systems in the United States and the Soviet Union. Modernization and the launching of submarines could be allowed to continue, since fewer submarines could actually be destabilizing, in that potential gains for anti-submarine warfare would decrease.

A final point to remember is that any form of arms control — a freeze, a ban or reductions — should never become an end in itself. The existence of nuclear arms necessitates a complex review of possible strategies to determine maximum stability in the context of mutual agreements. Stability must be the consistent and ultimate goal.

But stability is an evasive standard, for as long as we can judge stability, the weapons' balance is inherently stable. As long as deterrence functions and the potential for nuclear destruction remains untapped, the situation can be viewed as having some degree of stability.

Stability indicated purely by hypotheticals is by nature a controversial issue. While scientific research may expose effects of a nuclear exchange, no indisputable proof is available to determine the strategy with the greatest stability. The correct means to an end — figurative and not literal — is ultimately but a matter of opinion, priorities and perspective.

Andrea Stumpf is a senior international studies and German major from Chapel Hill.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

### Abortion an urgent issue

To the editor:

I'm writing in response to Steve Griffin's article, "Checking Some Facts," (DTH, Jan. 26). First, I will start by saying that my personal opinion and that in this letter I can be neither open-minded nor objective when it regards the abortion issue.

Griffin states that "a couple who desires sexual relations and practices birth control should not be forced to unwillingly assume the lifelong obligations of parenthood due to an unavoidable, unexpected birth-control failure." Suppose you are a careful, safe driver and your car's brakes fail at a red light — you indeed are going to be held responsible for any "accident" that occurs. In any area of life, personal freedom carries with it the responsibility for all actions taken. Abortion is not the answer to birth control failure and should by no means be permitted to be used as a backup for birth

control. A woman's personal freedom and rights (freedom to choose, rights to her own body, etc.) end where that child's life begins.

Griffin feels that the question of when life begins is a matter of semantics and personal opinion. Any hunter who is out hunting never shoots at an object unless he is absolutely sure whether it's an animal or a human being. Does not the unborn deserve the same respect? Regardless of whether one believes life begins at conception, the unborn should be esteemed higher than our own convenience.

Griffin says that a minimal level of quality of life must be assured if human life is to be considered sacred. How is this to be measured? What may be a minimal level of quality for one person may not be so for another. Sondra Diamond has cerebral palsy and is unable to dress herself, use the restroom on her own or write. The doctors told her parents she

had little or no hope of achieving meaningful "humanhood." Today she is a counseling psychologist. Has she reached humanhood?

Concerning rape and incest, what about a stubbed toe? You don't heal the wound by cutting off the whole foot. Abortion will only compound the problem. The emotional anguish will only be heightened; there are other solutions and "remedies" in these cases.

There are indeed many pro-lifers who are willing and who do help provide for and care for infants and their mothers before and after the child is born. There are several organizations set up to do just that.

Griffin states that the primary beneficiaries of a right-to-life stance are those who wish to soothe their own consciences. Who are the beneficiaries of a

right-to-choose stance? Certainly not the unborn.

It's been 11 years since the *Roe vs. Wade* decision, and 16.5 million babies have been aborted (which also means that there are just as many women who are suffering the physical and emotional consequences of having an abortion). I think it's been enough; actually, too much. This is not an issue we can just sweep under the rug and let someone else worry about. Every conscientious person in this nation has a responsibility to speak out to their legislators concerning this issue. Being uninformed can be no excuse for apathy. Find out about the issue. It is a matter of life or death.

Ana Kahn  
Chapel Hill

### THE Daily Crossword

by Peter Swift

ACROSS	31 Hair conditioner	65 Naval vessel	28 Trace of color
1 Followed suit	36 Small combo	68 Worshipped one	30 Borders
5 Hog-like animal	38 G-men	69 La Scala site	32 Is Douce
10 Freight boat	40 Monotonous sound	70 Voyaging	33 Lordly
14 Ear feature	41 Military aircraft	71 Actor	34 Move furtively
15 Sports palace	44 Use hook and line	72 Conte	35 Eldritch
16 Aa	45 Beloved	73 Hairy Asian beasts	37 Act the coquette
17 Naval craft	46 Jal —		39 Closes tightly
20 Actor	47 Spirited horse	DOWN	42 More rosy
21 Visionaries	48 Lapae	1 As well as	43 Fr. cheese
22 Schnozzle	50 — out	2 Rain hard	49 Bosc, for one
25 Numerical prefix	51 Flounder	3 Recedes	52 A US president
26 At a ship's stern	54 Perceive	4 Fiend	53 Have suitability
29 Alaskan city	56 Goes before	5 Sallor	55 Atomizer
	61 Poms	6 Onassis	56 Reimbursed
		7 Await a decision	57 Carnival attraction
		8 Unable to act	58 God of love
		9 Marathon runner	59 251
		10 Close with force	60 WWII battle site
		11 Shipping container	62 Where a tower leans
		12 Above	63 Onion's relative
		13 "Star —"	64 Historic periods
		18 Soon	66 Roadster, e.g.
		19 Collifure	67 No matter which
		23 Divan	
		24 Edit	
		26 Mercatorial collection	
		27 Forward part	

Yesterday's Puzzle Solved:

TRIP MAB GENT  
BOONIE TRE ASIAN  
ALONG NIETZSCHE  
SIS NEGATIVE KOS  
KEELER ABASES  
VOROSHILOV  
PIER SUERS TICED  
ERLIE AMI ANDY  
NATHA AVASTI TUNE  
LISENHOWER  
SPRINT PASCAL  
OLE CROSTER RIE  
BEETHOVEN SPIRE  
SADIE ART ARLES  
DYES LEO WOLF

### The chain of life

To the editor:

I suddenly became upset the other day when I saw the "Walk For Life". As I watched the participants proceed down Franklin Street toward Morehead Planetarium, my feelings became a mass of confusion. I felt coldness from the reason behind this walk, yet, I felt a certain warmth from the purpose behind this same walk. As I watched the anti-abortionists join hands and pray around Morehead's sundial, I was reminded of how inhumane, illegal and amoral abortions are. This bond that the anti-abortionists had created around the sundial, represented to me something that should never, ever be broken; it represented the chain of life.

We are all human; this is our chain. Though small fetuses have not yet come into the world, they have come into existence and, thus, they are human also. Then why, I ask, must they suffer such inhumane treatment? An abortion is just another form of slaughter. It is a harsh, inhumane act directed toward a young innocent human being. Though we may refrain from using the harsh term slaughter, the only difference between the

two words is that one refers to the inhumane killing of animals and the other word refers to the inhumane killing of babies.

Abortions are just as illegal as they are inhumane. Despite the *Roe vs. Wade* decision, I believe that abortions are illegal, and anyone with an ounce of morality or justice within them believes likewise. Today, since abortion has been legalized, people slaughter innocent babies and pass it off as consistent compliance with their rights.

Of course, most of us could care less about the right to life. In fact, we pessimists, hermits and other downright amoral souls in this world wish that we had never been born. Though many of us at times think that the little bit of happiness that we might stumble upon will never balance out with the constant miseries of life, there is only one basic notion behind this thought. This notion is that no matter how bad life seems to be, none of us can honestly say that we would have preferred to have been aborted.

Darlene Campbell  
Hinton James

### The gray area

To the editor:

With a great deal of interest and consternation, I have followed the series of articles in the *DTH* concerning abortion. Most striking about the opinions expressed by column- and letter-writers is their persistence in treating the issue in black and white, pro vs. con, Right to Life vs. Pro-Choice. As is often the case, the solution cannot be found in either of the extreme points of view, but rather somewhere in between.

There are times when abortion may be appropriate. Steve Griffin ("Checking some facts," *DTH*, Jan. 26) points out that "If human life is to be truly sacred and sanctified ... some minimal level of quality of life must be assured." Perfectly reasonable. There are also times when abortion may be inappropriate. David

Fazio and Tracey St. Pierre ("Waiving for life," *DTH*, Jan. 20) remind us that "science confirms the uniqueness of human life from conception on." Again, reasonable.

It appears to be of little value for the two sides to spout "facts" and "realities" when both have reasonable arguments, genuine motivation and sincere compassion. Neither side is wrong or right; neither is good nor evil. However, both risk dogmatism and inflexibility with their approaches. Instead of continuing their battle about abortion, I hope both sides will devote their collective energies to helping those with difficult pregnancies find humane, compassionate answers.

David Jarvis  
Carrboro

### Letters?

The *Daily Tar Heel* welcomes letters to the editor and contributions to columns for the editorial page. Such contributions should be typed, triple spaced, on a 60-space line, and are subject to editing. Contributions

must be submitted by noon the day before publication. Column writers should include their majors and hometown; each letter should include the writer's name, address and telephone number.

### 'DTH' dangerous to all

To the editor:

Your editorial "MIA" (*DTH*, Jan. 20) was most consistent with the more controversial editorials that have appeared on the back page during the course of this administration. It was written without a clue as to what is really going on and without the effort to find out. First, I want to properly inform the *DTH* and the student body on the crisis that you have created. I do not know where you got your information about the elections being postponed. If I had been asked, I would have said the elections would not be postponed. Also, you do not have to tell me the importance of a smooth-running election. I've run one or two myself. I've seen it from both sides. Positive action has taken place in the nearly two weeks since students returned from Christmas Break. I have extended offers for the position of Elections Board Chairman twice since I have been back. Do you want a quick replacement to the Elections Board? I could have given you that. But, wait until they screw up. I can only guess as to the editorials you probably would have written about how quickly they were chosen and grossly ill-prepared they were.

As to the irregularities you cited about past elections, I can only say that they were things that happened not because the Elections Boards were chosen late or slowly as you so eloquently put it but because they were things that just went wrong. These things can happen with the best Elections Board. I actively participated in three of these elections. I know what went on, I was there. How about you? Did you go and read past editorials or research the facts?

The candidates have spent hundreds of dollars and many hours on campaigns, and I know they take seriously the positions they seek. But I have not once made light of the fact by "dragging my feet on the needed appointments." I have been trying since the position was vacated to fill it. Before the *DTH* editorial staff continued escalating the "crisis" on Friday, did you ask me what was really going on? No. Had you done so, I would have filled you in on the circumstances surrounding the Elections Board. I also would have told you that two days earlier I had an Elections Board chairman. I also would have asked you not to go public with it in order for the new chairman to orient

himself with the office before being

bombarded with the duties of it. Not only have you created an issue that is now bigger than Season Ticket and ESPN, you have mounted an indirect attack on Chris Cox, the past chairman. He resigned for personal reasons, stated as such, and should have been left alone. Dragging his name around has only hurt a fine reputation that preceded him. He is a good man.

The editorial policy of the current *DTH* is grossly off base and extremely dangerous. If you write before research, fine. But when your facts are consistently off, your purpose seemingly only to generate student concern, feeling you are always right, you are dangerous to the student population and the University community. Do you understand what I am saying? You are the only major means to reach students on campus. You certainly don't tell them your editorials are not always right or that the information is incomplete. You mostly write as things appear. I'm one to tell you, things are not as they always appear.

When I took this office, I swore to two oaths. One to the students and the Student Constitution. The second to the people of North Carolina as a trustee of this University. I am bound as to what I can do and say. I have a system of checks and balances. I am also bound by a constituency of 22,000 students. These systems tell me when I am out of line and when to take appropriate action — I have standards to go by! What is the editorial staff going by to make sure what is written is at least factual? I am not talking censorship of the press, but responsibility of the press.

Kevin Monroe  
Student Body President

Editor's note: The *DTH* editorial "MIA" (Jan. 20) stated: "Without prompt action on the part of Monroe, the elections stand a good chance of being postponed..."

In reference to former Elections Board Chairman Chris Cox, the editorial stated: "Chris Cox, the board chairman appointed by Student Body President Kevin Monroe last October, resigned late last semester for personal reasons..."

The *DTH* does not believe the editorial constituted an attack on either Monroe or Cox.