

cont'd from p. 6

70,000 (estimate of American physician Dr. Robert Gale), where was the "peace" movement? Their silence was deafening. The very few who did protest did not march in front of Soviet embassies and consulates, to condemn their criminal disregard for safety and human life *but against their own nation's continued use of nuclear power!* Oh I see, Chernobyl was caused through the fault and negligence of the West and not the Soviet Union. It is because of these and the other insane double standards of the "peace" movement that make the CCPS necessary.

Ms. Kranjc states that the only option is cooperation. Perhaps when the Soviets stop imprisoning their own peace activists and torturing them with overdoses of brain crippling, neuro-pleptic drugs in psychiatric prisons, (Valery Godyak, Yuri Medvedkev, Yuri Kronopulo and Sergei Batrovic; who's "Group to Establish Trust between the USA and the USSR" was crushed by the KGB only two months after its founding on June 4th, 1982, and is still brutally harassed) cooperation will be possible.

—Michael Payne  
York University Chapter; Canadian Coalition for Peace through Strength

## Both sides doomed if race continues

Editor:

Your "Peace thru Strength" correspondent states that the US Pershings and Cruise Missiles were placed in Europe in response to the SS-20 Soviet missiles installed in the late 70's. He seems to forget however that the Soviets made many eminently reasonable disarmament offers prior to the US weapon deployment. They offered to reduce the number of their Intermediate-range warheads to the same number as the British and French, or to eliminate them entirely if the British and French would eliminate theirs. The US refused to discuss the British and French warheads. At that time these were enough to destroy about 1/3 of the Soviet urban population, but more important the British had plans to increase their arsenal to 900 First Strike-capable Trident warheads. Reagan wanted the Soviets to eliminate all their Euro-missiles while his allies built up theirs to a level capable of destroying all the Soviet cities.

This is just an example of United States' negotiating positions which have led many observers in the West to conclude that the US Government is not seriously interested in mutual balanced disarmament. The Soviets appear to be much more serious and reasonable about it. If the Peace Movement appears to be anti-American, it is for these very good reasons.

As for the letter from A. Kavchak, the 50,000 nuclear weapons in the

world have not prevented over 100 wars since 1945, some of which the Communists have won. If we have nuclear disarmament from both sides, we in the West can easily afford to boost up our conventional defences to prevent a Communist invasion of Europe or elsewhere. But if we continue with the nuclear arms race, both sides are doomed, as a nuclear war may start by accident, surprise attack, escalation, etc. If you wait long enough the possible becomes the certain.

—J.M. McNamee

## Grasping nuclear reality a must

Editor:

Re: Andrew Kavchak's March 12 letter. In response to my March 5 letter, Andrew accuses me of suggesting that "peace with the Soviets can only be obtained through appeasement." That is certainly not my belief. I distinctly used the term "cooperation"—something totally different from "appeasement." I only used the term "appeasement" in disputing the claim that we have an extremely narrow domain of choices, namely building up militarily or appeasing. If I did not make myself clear in that sense, I apologize.

The superpower relationship bears directly on the peace of the world, and it should be explicitly acknowledged that this relationship is far too important to be used for any sort of ideological propaganda. Yes, there are fundamental problems with the Soviet Union's closed society, but there are far better strategies for opening it up from the outside, rather than simply denouncing or cursing the Soviet Union in a chorus. Breeding antagonism widens the gap of effective communication between the two superpowers, and therefore only perpetuates old problems and creates new ones.

The immeasurable destructive capability of nuclear weapons must always be kept in mind when discussing the superpowers, and if it is not, the subject is out of context and out of date. If we are to survive, people must stop living as if they were in a pre-nuclear world. Once this reality is grasped, productive cooperation can take place.

—Susan Krajnc

## Nuclear weapons are a 'grey issue'

Editor:

The media, in its self-proclaimed infinite wisdom, tends to polarize all issues into black and white; right and wrong. It is not the fault of the media alone, however. Our entire society is based on this adversarial approach to living. We are proud of it, and call it more democratic. To deal with problems as black or white is more efficient, but often less correct.

Nowhere is the problem of black

and white more obvious than in the whole issue of nuclear weapons. On the one side we have communist Pinko subversives and hippie intellectuals calling for the removal of all weapons so that the world can be a beautiful and more peaceful place to live. On the other side are the right-wing war mongers, who want only to increase the arms supply to protect us from an evil enemy whose idea of moral fibre is something to be eaten for breakfast and then ignored.

The Soviets are not evil, and neither are the Americans. What they are is confused, because they are being forced to choose between black and white, when what may be the best solution is gray. Both sides acknowledge that there are far too many nuclear weapons in the world, and that they are something never to be used. The "peaceniks" then say that if they are never to be used, then why have them in the first place?

The answer is a sad truth: once we started building nuclear arms, we changed the world political climate such that these terrible weapons are necessary.

Nuclear weapons were originally deployed as part of a plan called "MAD," for Mutual Assured Destruction. Both sides would stay in line, because of the threat that the nuclear weapons would be used. Either side pushing the other too hard could result in the actual use of these weapons and the destruction of both sides.

Now, however, a new way of fighting a nuclear war has been conceived, and it is based on a pre-emptive first strike, which relies heavily on medium range missiles (the very missiles which both the United States and the Soviet Union are presenting negotiating to decrease). The idea is to overcome MAD by destroying the opponent's missiles in the silo before they can be launched. MAD is still in place, but now each side thinks it can come out on top.

The United States is in a better position to launch a pre-emptive strike, due to the deployment of their missiles within striking range of the Soviet ICBM silos. The trouble is that they would most probably have to give up all of Europe. Of course, such action would only be undertaken if Europe was already lost anyway.

The Soviet Union is incapable at present to easily launch such a strike. The Soviet attack would be detected and the American missiles could be launched. It would take about 25 minutes from launch to hit the American silos, unless submarines were used (and they could be detected before launching). A similar attack by the Americans would be over in 10 minutes.

The Soviet missiles must therefore be launched immediately on suspicion of an attack, or they will be rendered useless. This is a very dangerous situation. A misunderstanding similar to that which led to the

gunning down of Korean Airlines Flight 007 could lead to World War Three.

Perhaps we are doomed to live under the shadow of nuclear peace. Neither side will trust the other (and perhaps shouldn't—these weapons are now 2,000 times stronger than the Hiroshima bomb), so neither side will ever completely disarm. It is a sad fact of modern life.

Both sides will (hopefully) disarm until they have reached a level of *minimum deterrence*. This is a phrase which is open to interpretation. It might mean one missile targeted at one city, or two missiles targeted at each other. Once this minimum is reached, disarmament will go no further, because nuclear weapons are only a symptom—war is the disease.

—Mark Denman

## York environment possibly at risk

Editor:

I have examined with interest the latest proposed physical plan for campus development. My comments here relate primarily to the outer "development precincts." In some respects (eg. abandoning the Murray Ross extension, substituting decked parking for yet vaster expanses of surface lots) the current plan is a decided improvement over the original master plan. However, I remain concerned about the impact of development in three of these precincts.

1) The southwest: This potential development zone appears to extend to the top of the bank of the Black Creek Valley. Along the western margin of the York campus are extensive natural and semi-natural areas on tablelands abutting the valley. These areas include the overgrown farmstead site overlooking the valley in the southwest, the mature stand of White Pine and Black Cherry along a spur ravine directly west of Assiniboine Rd., and the old-fields and plantings directly west of Stong pond (though the latter is not part of the development precinct, I assume it to be a possible site for playing fields relocated from the northwest campus). The natural areas of the southwest campus provide a welcome respite from the concrete-and-lawn monotony of the central campus, as well as a locally significant corridor of wildlife habitat (eg. some 25 species of breeding birds, and many more migrants).

Development to top-of-bank will largely eliminate this tableland habitat and will have a certain adverse impact on that in the valley itself. In addition to the more natural areas, the cleared open space immediately southwest of the York apartments (on Assiniboine Rd.) is used by residents and others for gardening and informal recreational activities, and should be left for such purposes. A large portion of the proposed

southwest development precinct, along Murray Ross and Niagara Blvd. would remain for needed housing development.

2) The southeast: The southeastern sector of the campus contains a large natural regeneration area. This feature is not indicated on the proposed plan as a "woodlot", although part of it supports a dense growth of young trees. It is potentially of some scientific and educational value as an experimental successional community, and also provides habitat for wildlife (notably, Chorus Frogs). Since the proposed diagonal road is to pass directly through this site, I assume the sight is to be developed in its entirety. Such development would also displace several softball diamonds and a cricket pitch (to where?).

3) St. Lawrence Blvd. precinct: Development in this area could encroach upon and disturb the existing Keele St. woodlots. York Arboretum has been engaged in a project of gradually enlarging these woodlots by planting native trees. Development of the eastern part of the campus should be planned to accommodate this project.

Given the scale of development envisaged for the southern part of the campus, I am surprised at the modest size of the development precincts planned for the north. In particular, the northeast corner strikes me as an ideal site for development, as it is totally unused at present. In addition, frontage sites on Keele, Murray Ross and Niagara could be developed with minimal impact on the natural features and open space amenities of the campus.

YUDC is in a unique position; it can fulfill its mission of alleviating York's financial predicament without having to maximize its returns. There are a number of considerations for which the University ought to be willing to sacrifice the maximization of its financial resources. Respect for the natural environment is but one of them (others, and other aspects of this one, I will have other opportunities to address).

I await further details as the plan evolves.

—Allan Greenbaum  
Faculty of Environmental Studies  
York U Tenants' Association

## Yak mag pleased with initial results

Editor:

We were very pleased by the positive response to *Yak's* first issue; however, there were a couple of points that may need clarification.

Firstly, although *Yak* opted to publish only poetry in the spring preview, this reflected the editorial policy. We welcome all forms of writing as well as photography and fine art. Also, our response to contributors, although always in a

cont'd on p. 9

**STUDENT AND YOUNG ADULTS MISSION TO ISRAEL**  
**MAY 27 TO JUNE 16, 1987**

*Includes a ten day placement of a lifetime in Toronto's Project Renewal city. Become personally involved in the miracle that is changing the quality of life for thousands of Israelis.*

**SOME OF THE MISSION'S HIGHLIGHTS:**

Old City of Jerusalem • Briefing by government and Jewish Agency officials • Absorption Centre Archeological dig • Museum of the Diaspora • Youth Aliyah Village  
Special memorial to the victims of the Holocaust—Yad Vashem • Lunch with members of Knesset  
The mystique of Massada and Dead Sea visit • Home hospitality with Ethiopian Jews  
Golan Heights and tour of northern borders and settlement towns • Project Renewal  
Dinner with soldiers on a military base

**COST:** \$1,850 (approximately)  
(\$500 subsidy for those who stay to work in Project Renewal)

**AGES:** up to 25 years

**ISRAEL EXTENSION** (up to 60 days) and **EUROPEAN STOPOVERS AVAILABLE:** Info upon request.

**SPONSORING AGENTS:** United Jewish Appeal, Jewish Students' Union, Jewish Students' Federation

For more information contact Rayzel Robinson (JSF) at 736-5178

**C D C**  
Counselling & Development Centre

**WE CAN HELP**

- Personal Counselling
- Groups and Workshops
- Learning Skills
- Learning Disabilities
- Self-Help Programme
- University Skills Series
- Community Mental Health Consultation

Room 145  
Behavioural Science Bldg  
**736-5297**

Jewish Student Federation

**TOUR**

**ISRAEL**  
only **\$1995.**  
(plus airfare Montreal-Toronto)

Departure: **May 13**

**17 days** touring all the hot spots and Field School visit  
**17 days** on a kibbutz



Open ticket with stopover possible  
**Includes:**  
Airfare,  
Ground Transportation,  
Kosher Foods,  
Entrance Fees

For more details, call Jewish Student Federation 736-5178