

opinion

Against Soviets

'Ultimatum' prudent course of action

By Kelly Laughlin
Of The Print

When President Carter told the Russians to "back off" in his State of the Union address, he unfolded another chapter in the age-old drama of U.S.—Soviet relations.

A strong ultimatum—what Carter declared against the Russians—is now the best policy in resistance to the unpredictable political tactics of Soviet expansion.

President Kennedy did it in 1962 during the tense 13 day Cuban Missile Crisis, and early in 1947 the Truman Doctrine spelled out a dictum of "containment" in direct opposition to Russian ideology and policy.

But fervent anti-communism, common in the 40's,

50's and 60's has simmered a bit. Also, the danger of a nuclear holocaust has been recognized not only by the rest of the world, but her two super-powers as well.

The general mid-70's optimism in U.S.—Soviet relations began to crumble once again via Soviet disregard for post-war agreements.

Disregard for post-war agreements signed during the Helsinki conference, with respect to Eastern and Central Europe; aid to aggressive Arab forces in the Yom Kippur war; approval of Hanoi's disregard for the Paris accord on Vietnam which was signed by Moscow; political and financial support of the insurrectionist policies of Portugal's Communist Part; and intervention by Cuban proxy in the Angolan Civil war are a few Soviet actions that caused President Ford to want to take the word "detente" out of the official political vocabulary.

More recently, rules of behavior signed by Moscow with regard to the Middle East have not moderated Soviet actions in Afghanistan.

Soviet unpredictability and disregard for their own signed policies have caused American diplomatic policy toward the Soviets to teeter between realism, that is, condemning undesirable Soviet actions with "A balance of incentives for positive behavior, and penalties for belligerence," and idealism: An "ideologically in-

"A strong ultimatum—what Carter declared against the Russians—is now the best policy..."

different posture typified by negotiations." (Feb. 1977, The Healdine Series).

The ideologically indifferent posture toward the Soviets has been demonstrated by attempts to isolate the Kremlin through

the use of a trilateral approach, that is, greater attention to countries whose interest are more closely linked to our own. Originally, Western Europe, Japan, and Canada were the three countries involved in the policy.

The trilateral emphasis has been endowed with a higher sense of purpose than polite neglect of the Soviets, as demonstrated by the Carter administration's desire to restore normal relations with Red China and protect the Middle East countries and the rest of the world's economic interests through military assistance, pending return of the 50 Americans being held hostage in Tehehran.

By events in recent weeks and history, it is clear that trilateralism, whose most prominent proponent is security advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski, has failed to dissuade the Soviet leaders from pursuing policies they deem essential to the interests of their state.

The policies of trilateralism in South Africa, Europe, and most recently, the Middle East, have put Russia at loggerheads with the United States.

Not to say that trilateralism should be abandoned. The overall ideology is positive. Brzezinski describes it as "an active America, fearful less of an unlikely nuclear catastrophe than of our potential political and ideological isolation in the global community."

Neither to imply that channels of communication with the Soviets shouldn't remain open.

But there is little to be gained from inconsequential diplomatic agreements whose value is only the undue hopes they tend to generate. The undue hopes, once again, are our own, and again, our wits have been tested by the Soviet Union.

Let's hope the Kremlin can understand the implications of an ultimatum, if not a signed agreement.

Reinstatement of draft a fear in many

By Leanne Lally
Of The Print

The possibility of going to war frightens many people. Also frightening is the knowledge that many of us will be unwilling to be put into battle by a system known as the draft, which may soon be rein-

stated.

Young men ages 18 to 26 will soon have to register for the draft, and what's more, young women may have to also. Now, I don't know about anybody else, but personally, I do not want to be drafted.

The women's movement has

had a lot to do with this. Not that I'm a sniveling female who cracks under any kind of pressure. No, I believe in a lot of the things the women's movement has accomplished, but fighting in a war is not one of them. I'm too much of a baby and a fraidy cat. I can't help it—I was brought up that way.

I'm not ashamed of it, either. I'm not ashamed of my frail and feminine qualities. I enjoy it when a man brings me flowers, pays for my dinner, or opens the door for me. But I don't want those flowers to be handgrenades, that dinner he pays for eaten in a mess hall or the door that is open a helicopter door. I do not want to go to war.

All I say is have pity on us who admit we're the frailer of the sexes. Society has taught me that sometimes the best way out is to cry. But I don't know if that will work in this situation. Besides, if they draft us women, who will stay home and roll bandages and receive letters to home? Who will stay behind and root for our boys? It just won't be the same standing right next to your husband shouting, "I love you, come

home," while you're blowing away the enemy.

I don't think it's fair. I never tried to be a truck driver or a pro-football player, and now because some woman was afraid to admit she's a woman, I may go to war. I believe that there are things that a man can do that a woman can't, and vice versa. War is one of them. If some women are "gun-hoe" (excuse the pun) about going out and driving a tank or shooting at people in the jungle, I say let 'em go. But I'm not, I'm too scared. Besides I'm too small and I never get enough exercise, I probably couldn't even lift the gun. Sure, going into the Army could teach me a lot of things, like cleaning my room, for instance, but killing I don't care to learn.

I'm not the only one who thinks so. The Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors (COCC), has announced that they are registering individuals who are opposed to participation in the military.

CCCO has registered several thousand young people through its conscientious objection card service. According to Larry Spears, CCCO director, the card simply states,

"Because of my beliefs about war, I am opposed to participation in the military."

Betty Alexander, a National Selective Service spokesperson from Washington D.C., says the cards could carry a lot of weight in convincing a draft board of an objector's sincerity.

"CCCO is a very organized group," said Alexander. "If the draft is reinstated and a young man can prove he went on record in a time when he was not in danger of going to war, then it might have some influence."

Guess who is sending away for one of those cards?...

OK, now you are saying, "what a chicken, what a Commie, won't even protect her country." Well, you are wrong. I would protect America in any way I could, but I refuse to go fight for another country.

So there it is, plain and simple. I do not want to go to war and I really don't want to see anybody else go to war, either. But if I do go into combat, you can bet that I'll be the one shooting with her eyes closed.

For more information on CCCO's card program, write to CCCO, PO Box 15796, Philadelphia, PA 19103.

Clackamas Community College

the print

19600 S. Molalla Avenue, Oregon City, Oregon 97045

Office: Trailer B; telephone, 656-2631, ext. 309

editor: Leanne Lally; news editor: Mike Koller
arts editor: Elena Vancil; feature editor: Kelly Laughlin
sports editor: Brian Rood; photo editor: Duffy Coffman
copyeditor: Sandy Carter

staff writers: Sue Hanneman, Ramona Isackson, Don Ives
Lee Jeffries, Matt Johnson, James Rhoades, Tom Rhodes
Susy Ryan, Sherry Succo

staff photographers: Cathy Gross, Robert Hand
advertising manager: Tim Tyser; business manager: Ron Allen
advertising representative: Dan Champie
professional adviser: Suzie Boss

The Print, a member of the Oregon Newspaper Publishers Association, aims to be a fair and impartial journalistic medium covering the campus community as thoroughly as possible. Opinions expressed in The Print do not necessarily reflect those of the CCC administration, faculty or Associated Student Government.

