

## Reagan's 'zero option' — a positive policy

President Ronald Reagan, in a major foreign policy speech Wednesday, announced a fundamentally sound disarmament plan called "zero option." The "zero option" plan represents a substantial turnabout in the foreign policy direction of the Reagan administration. That policy turnabout is being met with approval both in the European community and in the United States by those growing more concerned with the escalation of nuclear hardware in Europe.

"Zero option" entails the halting of the planned Western European deployment of American Pershing 2 and ground-based cruise missiles in exchange for a reduction in the number of warheads on the Soviet SS-20 and other missiles presently deployed in Eastern Europe.

This is not the first suggestion of an exchanged de-escalation of nuclear weaponry in Europe. Romanian President Nicolae Ceausescu proposed just such an agreement last month. Reagan's "zero option" is couched in similar terms, though withdrawal of weapons is considered feasible by a gradual schedule with verification.

Reagan's plan will be part of the U.S.'s initial approach at the Nov. 30 Geneva talks with the Soviet Union on reducing nuclear forces in Europe. The merits of "zero option" are exemplary of the U.S.'s consistent effort to foster and maintain world peace.

The reality of nuclear weapons technology can't be ignored — nor can that technology of nuclear defense be dismantled completely. Banning the weapons does not eliminate them

from the arsenals of the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

Reagan's foreign policy shift seeks a parity rather than attempts to increase weapons strength over and above the Soviets. To try to outstrip the "other side" is an impossible game, a fool's defense, ending in stalemate for the world.

"Zero option" — as a means to achieve weapons parity — is not enough. The plan demands to be balanced by sincere negotiations to solidify peace, and continued talks on unilateral withdrawal of armaments. The SALT treaties have failed in this regard — yet, the struggle for disarmament must go on regardless of past failures.

The new foreign policy is intended to demonstrate U.S. support for nuclear weapons

control to the European community. European opinion has run high with anti-nuclear protests by Western and Eastern European groups. Reagan himself erred Oct. 16 when he said it was conceivable a limited nuclear exchange could be fought in Europe without either of the superpowers pushing the buttons.

Reagan's "zero option" is a positive turn from that fatal direction.

Reagan has come up with a moderate position on nuclear weapons deployment, one that should be endorsed by factions left or right. It represents another step to cement this all-too-frail peace in the world. Every step taken to maintain the mantle of peace is "historic."

## letters

### Justice is imperfect

Toocaj Tooladi's letter in the Oct. 29 Emerald reminds us that justice in capitalistic countries is imperfect and probably biased. I look forward to reading a letter from him that gives examples of justice in non-capitalistic countries.

Dick Ricketts

### YAF, not fair-minded

I was recently a member of the Young Americans for Freedom here on this campus. I could not, however, continue as a member in good conscience because of basic and fundamental differences with the entire platform of the YAF. These people are not, as they would like us to believe, fair-minded conservatives who want freedom and justice for all. Instead they are fanatically militaristic, inconsistent in their beliefs and totally opposed to all moderation or cool, calm reasoned logic.

The YAF calls for action against the Communist world. In 1960, the Sharon Statement (their founding charter) called the forces of international Communism the greatest threat to American liberty. They go on to say that the United States must stress victory over, rather than coexistence with, the Soviets is to stress world annihilation, rather than peace and detente. Can we really give credibility to a doctrine that suggests that we even have the ability to defeat the Soviets without destroying ourselves, and the rest of humanity as well?

The YAF supports US military involvement in Latin America to "allow the citizenry there to decide for themselves that they want democracy and freedom." They would have used nuclear weaponry on North Vietnam. Their most recent national platform called for the trial of Jane Fonda for treason, apparently her liberties are void when they disagree with her views.

The inconsistency of their views on the role of the government are also worth bringing up. They say that the individual is the master of his own house and that personal freedoms are the most important things in the world. And yet, they oppose abortion, calling it "America's Holocaust," they oppose liberalizing victimless crime laws, they oppose the 1964 Civil Rights Bill, they do as a whole oppose the draft, but several of the leaders of the local YAF favor mandatory national conscription.

They say that the government must do only those things that the people cannot do for themselves. And yet, the people of the inner cities are unable to provide jobs for themselves or good quality health care for their children. Does the YAF support government funded



jobs for these people? No. Does the YAF support any program to provide free, or low-cost, government subsidized health centers? No, they even oppose what meager social programs already exist.

No, this group does not want freedom for all. They want to be left alone to do their own thing — and you will be able to do yours too, if it is identical to theirs if they have their way. The answer to this barrage of left-wing propaganda on the campus is not a right-wing propaganda machine, the answer is in promoting a moderately conservative philosophy which can work, and given time will work.

Mike Rumble  
Junior, political science

### Who are terrorists?

The U.S. government and media cries about "international terrorism," but we can't let them pull the wool over our eyes. Who are the real terrorists?

Who has the largest killing apparatus in the world? Who invented the Atomic bomb and used it, and initiated the arms race? Who napped the Vietnamese and is now engaged in a genocidal war against the people of El Salvador? And closer to home — it is the U.S. government that committed wholesale genocide against American Indians and enslaved millions of African people for profit. And today the lynching, the murders of black children by cops, the malnutrition amidst wealth, sterilization, and the de-humanizing conditions continues to bring death and terror to black communities all across this continent. And yet the U.S. government has the nerve to label any people or nations who fight this oppression as "terrorists."

Black people have always resisted this oppression and terror and have organized on every level for their self defense and liberation. A recent example is the attempted expropriation of a Brinks Armored car by the Black Liberation Army and members of the Weather Underground. This was not a self-serving "bank robbery" but a recovery of funds stolen off the sweat, blood and poverty of African people. The money was to be used as resources for the black liberation movement.

It's now "open season" on the black community. Police and FBI are kicking down doors, stopping, searching and terrorizing black people and the "left" — gestapo style. There are criticisms that need to expose the errors of an approach which separates military

action from the educational, community and organizational work that must precede and accompany such tactics. Yet we must defend the Black Liberation Army and the entire black liberation movement such as put forth by the African People's Socialist party.

The focus must be turned against the U.S. government for the criminal terror it has consistently waged against people around the world in order to build and maintain the wealth, power and privilege of a very select few.

Devin Hess  
Kathy Knowles  
Carol Lopes  
Uhuru House Solidarity Committee

### Land-use response

This letter is in response to Ed Crockett's letter that appeared in the Nov. 17 Emerald. In this letter, he criticized Oregon's land use planning efforts. This letter contained significant omissions of fact, distorted interpretations of other facts, and hints of subtle racism, and so demands a response.

1. He claims that land use planning is a "no-growth" tool (presumably of a selected few). Not so. Planning expects growth and is primarily concerned with where to put it so that the quality of life is maintained for us all, including the newcomers.

2. He compares Oregon to Germany, both in size (about the same), and population (about 2.5 million for Oregon and 63 million for Germany). He implies that such a population level would be okay here. Do you want 63 million Oregonians?

3. He lauds the accomplishments of the Mormons in Utah, implying that the same could be done with the high, dry country of eastern Oregon. Have you taken a look at their water table lately? Planners have. Water tables all over the country are going downnnnn.

4. Finally, he implies that if Oregon is not filled with good white folks, it will be overrun with "foreign immigration," i.e., people who look funny and aren't like us. I wonder how the Italians and the Scandinavians would have accepted that argument, 50 or 100 years ago.

Crockett, you have your head partially buried in the sand. Why don't you finish the job?

Phil Bredesen  
Graduate, industrial relations  
Thursday, November 19, 1981