

Greenhouse effect: when will he learn?

The debate about global warming is similar to the debate about the effects of smoking cigarettes. More than 300,000 people die each year in the United States from the lung cancer they get from smoking, and countless studies have proved that cigarettes are hazardous to your health.

And the government still provides subsidies to the nation's tobacco farmers. Tobacco kills, but it employs. The jury is supposedly still out on its effects, depending on whom you listen to.

So it should come as no surprise that President George Bush, in his address to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change on Monday, put industrial growth ahead of concerns about global warming and the notorious greenhouse effect.

"Politics and opinion have outpaced the science" in some areas of the greenhouse debate, Bush said in his speech, suggesting it was too early to put curbs on industrial pollution for the sake of the environment. Other delegates to the same panel in Washington — from countries such as Norway, Denmark and Sweden — argued that enough scientific evidence is in to at least limit industrial carbon dioxide output to current levels.

Several European nations have already limited their pollution levels, and it is a shame that the United States, a leader in industry (and industrial side effects), will not do the same on a similar long-range scale.

The buildup of such pollutants is widely believed to be responsible for rising temperatures around the world. It is not as well-known, however, what the effects of that warming will be. The consensus seems to be that with the carbon dioxide-laden air trapping more heat from the sun, the weather cycle could be thrown out of balance, causing droughts and turning farmlands into deserts. Another scenario has the polar ice caps melting and flooding the world's coastal regions.

The potential effects themselves should have been enough to inspire Bush to make a long-range plan. Sadly, he did not.

Bush's comments to the delegation showed once again where his priorities are: economic growth and industrial profits, regardless of the consequences to planet Earth.

Our question to Mr. Bush: How long will it take you to wise up and see the effect humans are having on this planet before you agree to decrease pollution?

Like the people who decide to quit smoking the day they are diagnosed with emphysema or lung cancer, one gets the feeling that Bush will try to curb industrial pollution the day that waves from the Atlantic begin breaking on the steps of the White House.



Baseball owners should keep free agency

The nation's baseball fans are talking about strikes, and not the on-field variety. The probability of a labor disturbance breaking up the 1990 baseball season has increased with each frustrating meeting between players and owners over the last two weeks. It now appears that the owners will call a lockout and not open spring training camps (as is scheduled for Feb. 15) until a new contract is in place.

The current owner-player dispute centers on free agency and the whopping salary raises it has caused. There are now several grown men making \$3 million a year contributing nothing more to society than batting averages and home runs. Some owners also claim that free agency has hurt baseball by locating star players with the bigger clubs that can pay higher salaries, such as the Los Angeles Dodgers.

As an alternative to free agency, the owners are demanding players participate in a direct revenue sharing plan. For their side, the players not only want to keep free agency, but would also like to ease the requirements for a player to seek salary arbitration.

Right now, the count is full and neither side is stepping out of the box. In recent

baseball disputes, the owners have usually backed down, and we hope they do so now.

The owners should back down because free agency has been good for baseball. Gerald W. Scully's excellent look into the economics of the game, *The Business of Major League Baseball*, documents that free agency has not led to the rise of powerhouse big city teams. In fact, dynasties such as the New York Yankees with 33 league championships (no other American League team has more than 10) are less common since the advent of free agency. Big cities have not benefited from the drift of free agents more than small ones like Kansas City and Cincinnati.

Another point: Some fans balk at free agent salaries rising to multi-million dollar levels, but Scully's book also shows that players are only now getting paid what they're worth to their ball clubs in terms of attendance dollars and games won.

Baseball owners have been making a lot of money for a long time. Even the Seattle Mariners, the very worst team over the last decade, was recently sold for more than \$70 million. It's time the players got their share of the proceeds, and it's time the talk of baseball strikes and lockouts end. Play ball.

Letters

Three cents

Okay, okay; this issue has been run into the ground, but I must put my two cents in about abortion:

1. A woman's right to control her own body. This can't even be an issue because it is so basic. I consider it an essential presupposition to the argument.

2. When does life begin? This is the real basis for the dilemma. So far, even doctors are wary of stating a claim on the instant at which a life is born. How can one answer "at conception" when, upon the death of the mother, the cells would not be able to sustain life outside of her body?

My opinion is that the point in time at which a fetus/child is able to survive without the mother's body is the point in time that abortion should be unexceptionally illegal. Already, under our current laws restricting late-stage abortion, the child is protected.

What of rape or incest victims? What of them? Because the father is a criminal or an unavorable sort, should that have anything to do with what some consider "taking a life"? In my book, the same conditions stand for sex-crime victims.

I guess that makes three cents for me, but I have one more request: please refrain from labeling people as "mothers" before they've had a child; people who don't think abortion is right as "pro-lifers"; people who think we should all decide what is best for ourselves as "anti-life radicals." (ODE, Feb. 7).

Catherine Konsella
Student

Quick solution

I have a solution to this whole abortion issue. First of all, we'll get the government to pass a law stating that testicles are illegal, and any man refus-

ing to give up his right to have his testicles will be prosecuted, castrated and imprisoned. Second, women wishing to bear children will be artificially inseminated. That cuts out the whole accidental pregnancy factor, thus eliminating abortion.

Ge, what a great idea, why didn't someone think of this before?

Marla Montague
Springfield

Conservatives

Have you noticed how the news is full of stuff about "conservatives" these days? Conservatives in Eastern Europe are working to thwart or slow democratic reforms. Conservatives in the Soviet Union are busy causing problems for Gorbachev's efforts to reform the Soviet economy and open that society to freer expressions.

In South Africa, conservatives are threatening efforts to establish a democracy in the

nation torn by racist oppression. In Israel, conservatives have taken a hard line on the Palestinian question. In El Salvador, conservatives in the armed forces kill church workers, jail Americans and bomb the slums.

So what about the conservatives in this country? Are they leading us toward a more democratic future with freedom of speech, opportunity and privacy for all? Is George Bush's penchant for secrecy and double-speak his way of admitting the conservative Reagan revolution is over?

Tom Ribe
Graduate student

Perspective

I don't care who is the greatest quarterback to ever live, all I know is that Brian Bosworth is the greatest all-around football player ever.

He capitalized on controversy. He knew there are people

like you who will vehemently debate about an issue that is incredibly trivial. There will always be a better player in the future. The Boz knew that, so he took some steroids, made a big fuss about Seattle, made some commercials and even played a few downs in the NFL. Now he is a rich man because people like you buy into such trivial controversies.

The bottom line of sports is money. Montana is not making any money off of this controversy, only the owners are. The Boz is a hero because he found a way to get his share with the least amount of effort possible.

I love football. I even had a fantasy football team (Everett was my quarterback). All that I am saying is that you people sound ridiculous. Put things in perspective. Can't you find a more productive use for the education that you are supposedly receiving, rather than arguing about such trivial nonsense?

Cris Blake
Political Science
Friday, February 9, 1990