

OP/ED continued

crisis our leaders have made it out to be.

It's time to replace the head nodders, doom sayers and constitution ignorers with politicians who are more concerned with sound economic policy, constitutional law and honesty. We don't want all our decisions made for us. All we need are the facts.

Buck Tredway

Strategic Offense Initiative?

We Americans seem confused in the wake of the Iceland min-summit. how do we deal with a Soviet leader who proposes to stop this nuclear insanity once and for all while our president adheres vigorously to the development of a dangerous new weapon, Star Wars, or the Strategic Defense Initiative. Americans historically have opposed unilateral disarmament only because we were afraid the Soviets wouldn't be as humane. Now we must come to terms with the fact that Soviets have proposed disarmament and we are not so humane.

Complacent Americans have dutifully digested Reagan's lies about Star Wars. The press has allowed him to steer the debate, pitting "technological visionaries" versus "ye skeptics of little faith." Think about the logic Reagan uses. In ten years, the superpowers verify that all ICBMs are dismantled. Star Wars is designed to protect us from ICBMs. Do we need Star Wars in ten years? By answering "yes," Reagan is doing the equivalent of surrounding his house with sandbags during a drought! Thus, the relevant Star Wars debate addressed not whether it will work (because it may), but whether we need it. The question is not what scientists can do, but what they should do.

Meanwhile, the press asks the question, "Was Mini-Summit a Soviet Set-Up?" Of course it was. After historical breakthroughs in arms control was agreed upon, the Soviets re-introduced the stipulation that Star Wars research must be restricted to the laboratory. (Star Wars research requires extra-laboratory testing, so this restriction is severe.) Reagan has maintained his commitment to Star Wars all along, and as expected he refused to abandon his dream regardless of the arms control agreements. Iceland probably was a propaganda tactic of Gorbachev, but it worked to dramatize the impasse created by Reagan's Star Wars. Unfortunately, Reagan's propagandists have flooded the domestic airways since Reykjavic and the debate on Star Wars

Star Wars is not a defensive device. Its effect is offensive. Just as the development of the new MX missiles will prompt a corresponding Soviet response, Star Wars forces the Soviets to develop counter strategies, like anti-satellite weapons and additional ICBMs to flood the system. The liberal press coined the term "Star Wars" to ridicule the plan, but it has become common fare. The press should restructure the debate on Star Wars by renaming it, more accurately, the Strategic Offense Initiative, or SOI.

The continuing Geneva arms control negotiations are the most promising since SALT II. But Reagan's Strategic Offense Initiative stands in the way. The new Congress has the power to block funding for SOI research. Now it is up to the American public to reject Reagan's SOI propaganda, voice their conviction for arms control, elect sensible representatives, and hold them accountable for their positions on SOI.

Dave Snyder

Peace through Star Wars

"Boy he really blew this one." "He came home empty handed." "The talks collapsed and Star Wars is what the fate of the United States' foreign policy revolves on." These are the remarks that the media and many Americans are hurling at President Ronald Reagan. These people claim that the summit at Reykjavik, Iceland was a fiasco.

It was my contention that President Reagan made a wise decision about arms control in Iceland. I also felt that President Reagan established a bargaining agent. President Reagan had enough insight to know that if he would have signed the agreement that Mr. Gorbachev had proposed, he could have signed away effective arms control. By signing the agreement, the Strategic Defense Initiative would have been cast into oblivion. Halting SDI or 'Star Wars' is doing away with real arms control. The Star Wars plan is the most effective way of making the United States safe from not only a Soviet Union nuclear attack but from any nuclear attack from any country in the world. It would in essence be as if the United States had a shield over its head. The arms race would become extinct. If nuclear weapons are launched, SDI would prevent their ever landing in the United States. If the nuclear weapons are not effective, then producing them is futile and serves no purpose. Star



Wars is arms control.

President Reagan has also given the United States a great bargaining tool. It is obvious from Reykjavik that the Soviet Union does not seek the completion of Star Wars. The question is why do the Soviets not want to see SDI completed? The SDI plan can not possibly hurt the Soviets. It is for the protection of the United States. The answer to the question is that the Soviet Union does not seek true arms control or arms reduction. The Soviets see their edge crumbling in the wake of an idea that would finally put arms reduction on earth. It is my conjecture that the Soviet Union feels that if the arms race is ended then their already thin economy will crumble; of course that is a matter for the economists to decide.

The opponents of the SDI plan claim that SDI actually starts another arms race. That claim is ludicrous. If SDI is finished, then nuclear arms are automatically extinct. There will be no use for them. Opponents also bring to surface the idea that if the SDI plan is so sweeping, then why is the United States trying to keep it such a big secret. The only plausible reason for the secrecy is that if such technology gets in the hands of a nation that tries to its creation for evil, then SDI could be turned into an instrument of destruction instead of peace.

In conclusion, it seems that if the Soviet Union really wanted a reduction in the nuclear arms then they would certainly acclaim president Reagan for having a very brilliant idea; instead, they will employ spies to find the secret of SDI in order to make it work for them. The way the Soviet Union will make it work for them is unpredictable. That is probably the main reason as to why the United States keeps SDI such a tremendous secret. As for the people who think that Star Wars is a fiasco, the question to them is "What in the world do you think can be better than the absence of nuclear arms?" Reagan did not "sell the world short" in order to accomplish a fanciful dream. He took insight, delved into the future and pulled from the objectives that he found there. In all reality, President Reagan may have insured an end to the arms race. But as always, there will be those that condemn futuristic ideals. Such are the people who condemned Seward for purchasing Alaska, now one of the major producers of domestic oil. Such are the people who said man will never walk on the moon. Such are the people who say that 'Star Wars' will never be arms control.

Bobby C. Simpson

