

utation for excellence in news broadcasting, and CKDU-FM's new Phasetrack receiver will bring in the signal ever more clearly, providing the best of international news service to Halifax and Dartmouth.

Thanks and happy listening!
Yours sincerely
Michael Hymers
Public Affairs Director
CKDU-FM, 97.5

Littanism

To the editor,
I am writing in response to a letter in last week's *Gazette* regarding the anticipated construction of a Litton Industries plant in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island. To those unaware, this proposed plant has been subject to much debate on

the Island as of late. If a government contract for developing a low-level radar system is awarded to Litton, company officials say that Prince Edward Island will be the site of a plant to construct such a system.

The author of the letter I think has a jaded view of the potential benefits and detriments to P.E.I. which such a plant would bring about. I agree with many of his points, especially that the Island economy has been and will continue to be based on the primary industries of farming and fishing (tourism not withstanding). As a fellow Islander, I too am saddened by the so-called "erosion" of the rural life style which has always been synonymous with Prince Edward Island.

Does this mean, though, that Islanders should remain so complacent that we miss an opportunity for such an invasion of jobs and spin-off effects which the Litton plant represents?

Signed,
A realistic Islander,
David Campbell

SDI response

To the editor,
In response to Jamie Glazov's letter (Feb. 6, 1985), anti-SDI activists will always be against SDI because of the "unavoidable aspects of life (ie facts)". As comfortable as Jamie Glazov now feels under the promise of the "unpenetrable" shield of SDI, we feel there are more hopeful, constructive solutions to the threat of nuclear annihilation.

The reason both countries signed the ABM treaty, was first, they realized how defense building was destabilizing. Secondly, that it's impossible to defend against such a large nuclear arsenal. Glazov makes it sound like the Russians have a shield around their country already, but they are still in the early stages of research and testing. The Russians have not violated the ABM treaty. Both sides agreed to have ABM's around two cities. The U.S. dismantled their ABM's, the

Soviets left the partially built one around Moscow. Is this really a defense against the other side's massive nuclear arsenal?

Again, we suggest that it would be more constructive to sign a treaty banning the building of SDI on both sides. Russia is agreeing to on-site inspection, so let's take advantage of this offer. If we push for a test ban of all weapon systems neither side could build SDI and "mutual deterrence" would still restrain either side from attacking.

We're sure Mr. Glazov wants peace as much as anti-SDI activists, so why not proceed through the spirit of negotiation and put an end to this insane arms race that is draining both countries' resources.

Joel Bronstein
Sue Earle

Sly SDI

To the editor
In "Commentary: SDI" (Jan. 23), Jamie Glazov argued that "Star Wars" is a non-threatening project which will make nuclear weapons obsolete. Furthermore, he claimed, this ability has already been proven, and awaits only implementation. I wish to address several of the erroneous assertions he made.

"SDI...kills weapons not people ... SDI will make nuclear weapons obsolete." What sort of weapon is it that can destroy a missile, but which cannot be easily adapted to destroy ground targets, e.g. people. Why, one which is fired from space but does not penetrate the atmosphere, of course. What good, then, is such a weapon against a cruise missile? Against spies carrying suitcase bombs? Whether SDI works as intended or not, it will no more make nuclear weapons obsolete than the invention of the gun made the knife obsolete.

"... on June 10, 1984, the U.S. Army conducted a spectacularly successful test" ... A test, in fact, of an antiballistic missile system (ABM). The SDI proposal calls for at least three layers of defense against intercontinental ballistic missiles, of which ABM is only

one. A small part of one layer was reported to work in 1984. Proving that SDI works will involve first developing, then testing two more layers, including (perhaps) the Directed Energy Weapons known affectionately as "Ronnie's Rayguns." More importantly, the Command, Communications, and Control Intelligence (C³I) system which will integrate the three layers of weaponry, as well as detecting and tracking the identifying likely targets, must be developed and tested. This part of the system is most critical, since it must be able to function without human assistance: A computer network capable of fighting World War III intelligently.

"All experts on SDI have confirmed that a working system can be placed in space by the early 1990's." *The Strategic Survey 1984-1985*, published by the International Institute for Strategic Studies, London, contains a discussion of SDI in which SDI supporters are quoted as citing the mid-1990's as the date of the deployment of one part of the SDI system. Some dates mentioned for the completed project lie well into the next century.

Mr. Glazov is, however, correct when he says that SDI will substantially complicate Soviet offensive doctrine, whether it is proven or not. Let us not think, though, that it will thereby simplify Western planning. What do we do while SDI is being deployed, but is not yet operational? What do we do about third world nuclear capabilities? What do we do about the entirely too plausible threats of counter-measures which could render SDI "harmless space junk"?

The Strategic Defense Initiative might work. There is no denying the possibility, however remote. But the possibility that it might not work, and the effects in any case on international politics are too complicated to brush off lightly as Mr. Glazov has. Let us go forward with our minds open to all possible futures, in order that we are not fatally surprised by the one we get.

Ross M. Dickson

SEA HORSE TAVERN

A meeting place where the untraditional is a tradition

Beside Cleves on Argyle Street
1665 Argyle Street, Halifax, NS

SUPPLEMENT YOUR STUDIES



University Bookstore
Lower Level, Student Union Building

LITERACY IS NOT HEREDITARY. WE PASS IT ON.

Education is a valuable gift of hope, interaction, and self-sufficiency. A gift that has to be passed on.

For 25 years we have been supporting literacy programs in over 90 developing nations. Passing on the basic tools needed for social and economic development and the realization of human potential. By sending books. By supplying paper where shortages exist. By educating parents as well as children. By giving hope. Progress has been made. But there is so much more to do. Help us pass it on.

CODE LIGHTING THE WAY TO LITERACY FOR 25 YEARS

Enclosed is my contribution of \$_____ to support the cause of literacy in the Third World.

To make a phone donation call toll free 1-800-268-1121.

I understand I will receive information on exactly how my money has helped.

I am interested in the work of **CODE** (Canadian Organization for Development Through Education).

Please send me additional information.

Name _____
Address _____
City/Town _____
Province _____ Postal Code _____

CODE: 321 Chapel Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1N 7Z2 (613) 232-3569 (No. 0369876-29-10) Contributions are tax deductible.

