

Bush and Gorbachev move up summit date

WASHINGTON - President Bush and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev will meet for a superpower summit in the United States beginning May 30, U.S. and Soviet officials said Thursday as both sides returned to bargaining on possible arms-control treaties.



White House spokesman Marlin Fitzwater said several major agreements could emerge at the summit, including a long-sought Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty to limit long-range nuclear weapons.

But Bush said merely that the summit would provide "time for a lot of dialogue and a lot of discussion."

Fitzwater said the summit -- Bush's second meeting as president with the Soviet leader -- would be a "tough love" encounter, with the crisis in Lithuania a central topic.

Bush and Gorbachev last met early in December at the Mediterranean island of Malta. Since then, pushes for independence in Lithuania and other regions of the Soviet Union -- and the Soviet response to them -- have strained superpower relations.

The timing of the summit, earlier than the late-June schedule originally envisioned, raised new doubts on whether all details of an arms pact could be nailed down in time.

A senior U.S. official, speaking on the condition of anonymity, said "it depends in some part on what we're able to do here" in Washington talks between Secretary of State James Baker III and Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze.

The official said there was a good chance that major issues could be resolved by the summit date but "realistically" the actual treaty-signing might have to wait until later in the year.

Soviet negotiator Yuri Nazarkin was even more blunt, saying: "Tak-

ing into account (the summit is) in seven weeks, it's impractical, I think, to expect it (the treaty) is going to be signed at the summit."

Simultaneous announcements of the summit came from the White House and the Soviet news agency Tass early Thursday as Baker and Shevardnadze were holding their second day of meetings on arms control and other issues.

"There's still a lot of work to do, particularly in light of the fact that the summit will begin on the 30th," Baker told reporters. "So we have our work cut out for us."

Both the Washington and Moscow announcements gave the summit dates as May 30 to June 3.

However, Fitzwater said all five days might not be used. "It could turn out to be a two or three-day summit, depending on travel schedules," he suggested.

U.S. officials were also vague on whether the meeting would take place entirely in Washington, or at some other location as well -- such as the president's oceanside home in Kennebunkport, Maine.

Gennadi Gerasimov, the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman, told reporters at the State Department on

Thursday: "It's going to be a working visit; no time for sightseeing."

Just this week, the Bush administration was talking about the last two weeks in June for the summit. Neither side on Thursday gave any precise reason for moving the dates up -- other than citing scheduling difficulties.

Gerasimov said Bush had a heavy schedule in June and that Gorbachev wanted time to prepare for the meeting of the Soviet People's Congress in early July.

Standing alongside pop singer Michael Jackson at a Rose Garden ceremony honoring the musician, Bush said he was pleased that the summit dates had been set. "Dialogue is important. And I'm looking forward to seeing Mr. Gorbachev here," he said.

He said of the meetings at the State Department, "Conversations with Mr. Shevardnadze are going reasonably well."

Fitzwater said that the crisis in Lithuania would "undoubtedly be an issue" at the summit and that the president intended to raise it. "If anything, Lithuania makes the summit even more important," the spokesman said.

"I would characterize this summit more in terms of demonstrating the kind of tough-love working relationship that we were able to develop with the Soviet Union by virtue of four or five summits," Fitzwater said.

Gerasimov, the Soviet spokesman,



indicated that Baker had energetically raised U.S. concerns about the use of Soviet force in the breakaway Baltic state in his sessions with Shevardnadze. "There was a serious, hardball exchange of opinions on this subject," Gerasimov told reporters.

Researchers find little evidence of abortion's emotional hazards

WASHINGTON - Legal, voluntary abortion in the first trimester of pregnancy does not threaten most women's mental health or cause them great emotional distress, according to a new study.

Though some women may feel regret, sadness or guilt, "the weight of the evidence from scientific studies indicates that legal abortion of an unwanted pregnancy in the first trimester does not pose a psychological hazard for most women," said the study, to be published Friday in the journal *Science*.

Olivia Gans, director of American Victims of Abortion, called the study "a manipulation" of data from earlier studies.

"When you look at these studies, you can twist them any way you need to get whatever conclusion you want," she said.

The new study was commissioned by the American Psycho-

logical Association, which asked six experts to examine all current research and determine if a valid conclusion could be drawn about post-abortion psychological effects.

Nancy Adler, a University of California-San Francisco professor of psychiatry and lead author of the report, said the panel surveyed more than 200 studies and found only "about 19 or 20" that met solid scientific standards.

Once those studies were examined, she said, the conclusion "was really quite clear."

The APA convened the panel in 1988 after then-Surgeon General C. Everett Koop reported that studies were inadequate to draw final conclusions about the effects of abortion on women's mental health.

In the *Science* report, the authors said case studies have shown that some women do experience "severe distress . . . after abortion and require sympathetic care."

But for the vast majority of

women who have voluntary abortions, "severe negative reactions are infrequent in the immediate and short-term aftermath," the study said.

The greatest distress, the study found, "is likely to be before the abortion."

"Severe negative reactions after abortions are rare and can best be understood in the framework of coping with a normal life stress," the study said.

"I feel comfortable about the conclusion that there is little psychological hazard for women," Adler said in a telephone interview. But she noted that there is a need for scientific studies that would compare the effects of abortion with that of other stressful events in life, such as divorce or death of a family member.

Adler said studies of the psychological effects of a death have shown that if there is no negative mental health response within a few months, there is little likelihood that one will develop later.

As a result, she said, "there is reason to believe that there will be very little long term effect" from abortion.

"As a scientist, I really can't say anything beyond two years," she said.

"Two years is not enough," said Gans, who said she had an abortion in 1981. "I know many years later you still have to deal with emotional debris of that experience."

She said the effects can show up five to 10 years later and she described them as similar to the post-traumatic stress disorder experienced by combat veterans.

Gans' organization is associated with the National Right to Life Committee.

In addition to Adler, the co-authors of the *Science* study were: Henry David of the Transitional Family Research Institute in Bethesda, Md.; Brenda Major of the State University of New York, Buffalo; Susan Roth of Duke University, Durham, N.C.; Nancy Russo of Arizona State University, Tempe; and Gail Wyatt, University of California, Los Angeles.

Science is the journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Population expert credits rich for destruction of environment

PITTSBURGH - One American does 20 to 100 times more damage to the planet than one person in the Third World, and one rich American causes 1,000 times more destruction, a population expert said Thursday.

"The most serious population problem in the world is right here in the United States," said Paul Ehrlich, Stanford University professor of population studies.

"The most common misperception of the population problem is that it's a problem of poor Indians who don't know how to use condoms," he said. "Actually, the problem in the world is that there are too many rich people."

Ehrlich and other environmentalists spoke to about 1,200 students, teachers, garden-club members and corporate executives at a conference on solving global environmental problems.

He said the current world population of 5.3 billion is 1.8 billion more than in 1968 when he first prophesied the problems of overpopulation in his book "The Population Bomb."

He and his wife, Anne Howland Ehrlich, who co-wrote the current book, "The Population Explosion," say this decade will be the turning point for global environmental problems.

"If we don't see some real action in this decade, it will probably be too late to avert some very serious problems" including inadequate food

production, global warming, species extinction and deforestation, said Mrs. Ehrlich, associate director for the Center for Conservation Biology at Stanford.

Ehrlich railed against highly developed nations like the United States that he claims consume too much of the world's resources.

"The birth of a baby in the United States is something on the order of 20 to 100 times more disastrous for the life support systems of the planet as the birth of a baby in poor countries like Bangladesh or Venezuela," he said.

Mrs. Ehrlich said she and her husband based the figures on statistics compiled by the United Nations on per capita commercial energy consumption, an index used by environmentalists to measure damage to the Earth.

"If it's a (rich) baby, it could be a thousand times more," Ehrlich said. "Actually, the problem in the world is that there is much too many rich people. . . . It's not how many people you have but how those people behave."

People who drive gas-guzzling luxury cars, air-condition their homes and live from what Ehrlich calls "high-intensity-the-hell-with-tomorrow agriculture" do far more environmental damage than subsistence farmers, he said.

But he was not promoting the idea

that Americans should adopt a peasant lifestyle.

In highly affluent Sweden, the average person uses about 60 percent as much energy as consumed by the average American, Ehrlich said.

"We are super consumers and very unselective, and we're extraordinarily incompetent and sloppy with our technologies," he said.

Several environmentalists at the conference echoed Ehrlich's assessments on overpopulation and his claim the world is running out of time to find solutions.

"You cannot address the problems soon enough," said George Woodwell, president of the Woods Hole Research Center in Woods Hole, Mass.

"We are driving the Earth into impoverishment. We are living on its capital," he said. "We're eating up the standing stocks of trees and nutrients and soil in the process of feeding the current 5.3 billion people on Earth. In doing that, we make the Earth less capable of supporting people in the future."

In terms of global warming, the United States, with about 5 percent of the world's population, produces 25 percent of the world's output of carbon dioxide, believed to contribute to the greenhouse effect, said Peter Raven, director of the Missouri Botanical Garden and professor of botany at Washington University in St. Louis.

Trade negotiators reach agreement

WASHINGTON - U.S. and Japanese negotiators on Thursday announced completion of an unprecedented agreement pledging to reduce trade frictions.

The U.S., according to officials, pledged to increase efforts to improve America's education system and pointed to proposals the administration is already pushing to cut the federal budget deficit and to provide tax credits for increased personal savings.

The Japanese pledged to deregulate their complex goods-distribution system and to boost government spending on public works projects, thus expanding the volume of work on which American firms could bid.

Daily Nebraskan

Editor	Amy Edwards 472-1766	Photo Chief	Dave Hansen
Managing Editor	Ryan Steeves	Night News Editors	Jana Pedersen
Assoc. News Editors	Lisa Donovan Eric Planner	Art Director	Diane Brayton
Editorial Page Editor	Bob Nelson	General Manager	Brian Shellito
Wire Editor	Brandon Loomis	Production Manager	Dan Shattil
Copy Desk Editor	Darcie Wiegert	Advertising Manager	Katherine Policky
Spec's Editor	Jeff Apel	Sales Manager	Jon Daehnke
Arts & Entertainment		Publications Board	Kerry Jeffries
Editor	Michael Deeds	Chairman	Bill Vobejda
Diversions Editor	Mick Dyer		436-9993
Graphics Editor	John Bruce	Professional Adviser	Don Walton
			473-7301

The Daily Nebraskan (USPS 144-080) is published by the UNI. Publications Board, Nebraska Union 34, 1400 R St., Lincoln, NE. Monday through Friday during the academic year; weekly during summer sessions.

Readers are encouraged to submit story ideas and comments to the Daily Nebraskan by phoning 472-1763 between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. Monday through Friday. The public also has access to the Publications Board. For information, contact Pam Hein, 472-2588.

Subscription price is \$45 for one year.
Postmaster: Send address changes to the Daily Nebraskan, Nebraska Union 34, 1400 R St., Lincoln, NE 68588-0448. Second-class postage paid at Lincoln, NE.

ALL MATERIAL COPYRIGHT 1990 DAILY NEBRASKAN