daily nebraskan

opinion/editorial

Reagan arms policy is unrealistic

President Reagan's announced military buildup represents a stark return to Cold War philosophy without any serious consideration to existing political and military concerns.

Reagan's plan for the development of a limited MX missile system and B-1 bombers will only exacerbate the arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union.

For years, the United States has argued that the Soviets were adding to the arms race. But with the Reagan plans announced Friday and the apparent inability for any real progress at SALT talks, it appears the nation is hurtling toward military buildup at an unprecedented speed.

The Reagan price tag for the MX and B-1 systems is an astounding \$180 billion. That price is just an estimate and probably doesn't take into account cost overruns or inflation. Previous administrations' price estimates for defense were wrong and there is no reason to believe Reagan's figures are any more accurate.

The administration, in its obsessive desire to send a strong signal to the Soviet Union on our military prowess, has based its decisionmaking on political rhetoric. Reagan, reverting to acting days, comes off like a militaristic Tarzan solidly thumping

a-i-

120.000

his chest about how America must rebuild and be prepared for the Soviet threat.

Reagan's decision to scrap the foolish MX shell-game proposed by the Carter administration has been criticized as making the system even more vulnerable than the overworkable rotation of the underground missiles.

The new plans call for 36 missiles to be housed in existing holes for Titan missiles. The holes would be "super-hardened" to guard against Soviet attack.

Where the remaining 64 missiles will be housed is still being considered. The United States will have until 1984 to decide whether to base the rest aboard aircrafts, in deep underground silos or in bases defended by other missile systems.

The motivation for this military madness is the belief that the nation's "window of vulnerability," our ability to repel a first-strike by the Soviet Union, has cracked wide open.

Actually, opinions differ on this crucial issue. Reagan and his people say the nation is inadequately prepared to defend against a first strike. Opponents argue that the existing 1,054 land based missiles are an adequate deterrent.

Herein lies part of the problem. We hopefully will never know whose system is better. Beyond the puny question of who has the biggest bombs, the larger question of global annihilation rests squarely on the shoulders of Soviet and U.S. leaders.

Much like John Kennedy in 1960, Reagan talked throughout his 1980 campaign about the missile gap between the United States and the Soviet Union. Neither campaign claim has been verifiable but it is a nice, soft political issue that brings voters out in droves.

The administration should reexamine its position of arms limitation talks. Arms talks may not be the perfect solution, but the question of weapons, defense systems and first strikes only proves we live in an imperfect world.

We should remember that the original SALT I treaty was signed in 1971 in the midst of the most extensive bombing in the nation's history. The Soviet Union and the United States need to reach agreements over arms – but through discussions, not in the trenches fighting.

The only positive aspect of the Reagan buildup is the possibility that it might prompt a revival of an old 1960s protest song.

Perhaps, Barry McGuire's "Eve of Destruction" would serve as a good theme song for the administration's policies. But such policies only increase the likelihood that the words will ring true.





Music protesters overlooked 'White Christmas'

The recent burning of record album covers in Grand Island was a daring move indeed.

Sponsored by a fundamentalist Christian group, the bonfire/media event was meant to protest the obscene, drug inspired lyrics of today's rock music. But even Beethoven got tossed in the flames, suggesting these particular church goers had Ludwig's number long before the rest of us suspected the deviant nature of his classics.

casey mccabe

I'm one American who thinks they've only scratched the surface. The underlying current of popular music has long been subversive, causing people to dance, sing and buy foreign made stereo systems.

Some choose to look at today's music as artistic expression that merely reflects the atmosphere of the world we live in. But others more astutely realize that rock music is an effective lobbying organization of Satan's most trusted guitar-wielding demons.

If you'd like to join the cause, have some friends over this weekend for an album-fry. Here's a partial list of some records they overlooked in Grand Island:

"In The Mood" – Glenn Miller: The obvious question here is "in the mood for what?" The lewd brass section suggests it's not just dinner and a movie. Remember, children may be hearing this.

"White Christmas" - Bing Crosby: Though this multimillion seller seems harmless enough, it was reportedly

written by Irving Berlin during a late December flight to Bolivia. How many people have turned to drugs at Berlin's subtle suggestion?

"Que Sera, Sera" – Doris Day: Translated this means "whatever will be will be," and no matter how you slice it folks, that sounds like an endorsement of anarchy. Torch it.

Anything by Englebert Humperdinck: I don't know about his music, but his name sounds positively obscene.

"Angels We Have Heard On High" – The Norman Luboff Choir: Again, high on what? And what's this about flying winged humanoids singing "Gloria"? I suspect "Excelcius Deo" refers to the Latin name for some psychedelic mushroom the composer swallowed before beginning his "trip."

"Love Is A Many Splendored Thing" – The Mike Curb Congregation: Sure, love is a many splendored thing . . . if you're legally married. How do we know the composer wasn't living in sin and engaging in the bizarre sex practices so coyly referred to as "love" these days. How many people have been listening to this music in dentist offices and then suddenly found themselves buying bondage equipment at the song's subliminal urging? It's better to be safe than sorry, so throw this one in too.

"Zipidee-Do-Dah" from Songs of the South: It's not clear what this song actually means, but Walt Disney was a known drug user. Yet we give these records to our children like they were candy. There's no need to even go into the underlying perversity of Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs.

"The Star Spangled Banner" - Francis Scott Keyes: Sadly, even our national anthem is tainted. Take the first line "Oh say can you see, by the dawns early light?" What was Keyes on that made him stay up all night, and so bleary eyed he couldn't distinguish a bomb in front of his face?

Continued on Page 5

A more sane insanity defense offered

To the surprise of no one, John W. Hinckley Jr. will plead insanity in the shooting of President Reagan and three others last March. From the defense point of view, it's the only plea that makes sense.

With the evidence of eyewitnesses, TV footage and Hinckley's own statements, it would be tough to convince a jury that somebody else did the shooting. If that were the only question at issue, conviction would seem assured, and Hinckley would face up to life imprisonment.

But if the defense can demonstrate that Hinckley was insane at the time of the shooting and that the assault was the product of his mental disorder, then he would be innocent of the charges against him. He could be a free man in 50 days.

william raspberry

If an insanity plea is a reasonable strategy for the defense, it strikes many of the rest of us as insane. Yet it is excruciatingly difficult to come up with an approach that makes sense in these cases. Clearly there are people who are so deranged that they are unable to control themselves, or who are so deluded that they don't know what they are doing. It is unfair on its face to conclude that such people are "responsible", in the legal sense, for their actions. And if they are not responsible they are not criminals deserving of incarceration, but sick people in need of treatment.

The difficulty is in determining legal responsibility. Sen. Orrin Hatch, R-Utah, outlined the basic problem on March 26, four days before Reagan and the others were shot, when he introduced legislation to limit the insanity defense.

"The traditional insanity defense," he said, "is both a legal anachronism and a concept ill-suited to modern psychological theory. It presents issues — important issues — that are not susceptible of intelligent resolution in the courtroom environment. Trials in which the insanity defense has been raised have often degenerated into swearing contests between opposing teams of expert witnesses, all of whom are forced to translate the language of the psychiatric profession into the quite alien language of the legal profession.

"This takes place within the context of convolution, hypothetical questioning that yields responses that can only be confusing and misunderstood. They certainly contribute extremely little toward the pursuit of truth."

He is right. It seems disconcertingly easy to find reputable psychiatrists to take either side of the question of responsibility, and non-expert jurors are forced to choose between conflicting offerings of expert testimony.

Continued on Page 5

