

# **Real Doves Don't Ban Tests**

*Robert W. Poole, Jr.*

**I**n August 1985, on the 40th anniversary of Hiroshima, Mikhail Gorbachev announced that the Soviet Union had halted all nuclear weapons tests and invited the United States to do likewise. Despite exhortations by columnists and arms-control advocates, the Reagan administration has thus far ignored Gorbachev's offer.

At first glance, such a stance appears nothing more than mindless hawkishness. After all, both the United States and the Soviet Union possess enough nuclear weapons to destroy each other as functioning societies. Why continue testing so as to continue building more of these horrible instruments of mass destruction? Besides, unlike other forms of arms control, where cheating is a major problem, nuclear explosions are hard to hide. If the Soviets were to cheat, it's unlikely they could hide the fact, and we could resume testing, too.

Would that the world were so simple! In fact, if your concern is with minimizing the threat of mass destruction posed by nuclear weapons, then you should favor continued nuclear testing, not a ban. The reason has to do with the evolution of nuclear weapons and guidance systems over the past 40 years.

The nuclear weapons of the 1940s and '50s were crude, brute-force devices. They are often referred to as "city busters" because that is all they were good for. The delivery systems, initially manned bombers and later on the early ballistic missiles, were so inaccurate that the warheads were made very large—in the multi-megaton range—to compensate. That way, a miss really was as good as a mile, but at the price of awesome destruction.

By the '60s, guidance-system technology began to improve dramatically, and warhead sizes began to decrease. Today's U.S. ballistic-missile warheads are typically in the range of several hundred kilotons, and while the Soviets still have many warheads larger than a megaton, their warheads' average size has been steadily dropping as well.

But even today's newest ballistic missiles are still only accurate to within a thousand feet or so. The real breakthroughs in guidance have occurred with cruise missiles. These tiny, jet-powered weapons have "active" guidance systems that can home in on a specific target (rather than simply being aimed and lobbed, as ballistic missiles are).

Cruise missiles can be made accurate to within tens of feet, rather than tenths of miles. So they require warheads substantially less destructive than ballistic missiles or bombers. That, in turn, means they can be used against a military target without wiping out the adjacent city and its population.

Most of the present U.S. nuclear arsenal consists of large, old, inaccurate weapons—especially the bombs carried on B-52 bombers, the warheads on Minuteman II land-based missiles, and the warheads on the Poseidon sub-launched missiles. Should nuclear deterrence ever fail, and a war break out, the use of those weapons (and their Soviet counterparts) would wipe out cities and risk causing nuclear winter. The use of cruise missiles would not. It is imper-

ative—morally imperative—that the old weapons be retired and replaced with smaller, accurate weapons usable against military targets.

A comprehensive nuclear test ban, however, like a nuclear freeze, would make it impossible to carry out this essential modernization. Nuclear-warhead design is an iterative process, like every other form of technology. New designs and modifications of existing designs must be tried out to see whether they work before being put into production. A test ban would therefore preclude the very modernization that can make the world safer.

However much we might wish it, nuclear weapons cannot be disinvented. And until a robust set of defenses against nuclear attack is actually in place, we dare not risk giving up some form of nuclear retaliatory force. But we can and must make progress toward a world where mass destruction is no longer the basis of our nuclear policy. A "build-down" to small, accurate warheads is an important step in that direction. It will only be possible if we can continue to test new high-tech warheads as they are developed.

## **Tempted to Aid? Just Say No**

*By Virginia I. Postrel*

**I**t was peer pressure. Everybody's doing it, Bob told Ron. If you want to be popular, you've got to do it, too. And Ron wanted so much to be popular. Did he say no, like Mommy always says to? No, he said yes.

And now you and I and the rest of American taxpayers are paying \$50 million to help the Soviet Union buy wheat from U.S. farmers. Ronald Reagan, "the leader

of the free world," couldn't stand the pressure from Robert Dole, the leader of a bunch of Kansas farmers. To buy the farmers' votes, he sold out to the evil empire.

He even admitted it. "The truth is I didn't make this decision for them [the Soviets]. I made it for the American farmer," he said. The subsidized sale is "just a temporary policy," declared Reagan. "We're not out as a matter of policy to continue

## editorials

subsidizing the Soviet Union."

We all know how temporary "temporary" government programs are. And besides, aid is aid. Instead of paying the current U.S. price of \$110 a ton—as they're supposed to do under a treaty, or contract, signed in 1983—the Kremlin's hard bargainers will now pay \$85 a ton, with the difference picked up by you know who.

This subsidized wheat will help the Soviets once again avoid the consequences of their oppressive and inefficient economic system. It could well start a trade war with the Europeans, Canadians, and Australians. And it will help some American farmers keep pretending that their work is economically productive.

**T**hat illusion, it seems, is worth any price. "Faced with a severely crippled farm economy and with our agricultural imports now actually surpassing exports, can we afford not to adopt a vigorous export policy to take on the European Community?" writes Rep. Vin Weber (R-Minn.) in the *Wall Street Journal*. "Would not any reasonable business, faced with stiff competition, adjust to the reality of the marketplace, if only to stay in business and prevent bankruptcy?"

If "we" were in the agriculture business, we wouldn't sell wheat to the Soviets at a loss and try to make it up on volume—essentially what Weber advocates. But *we* are not in business. *Farmers* are. And they get plenty of money from the rest of us to support their rural lifestyles. (Thanks to all those subsidies, Nebraska last year scored the highest percentage gain in per capita income of any state.)

Weber is right about one thing, though. Farmers do need to adjust to the reality of the marketplace. No more checks for not growing crops. No more rich Uncle Sam to buy the "surplus" they don't want to sell at market prices. No more subsidized sales.

This latest sale does more than reward uneconomic production, however. It gives aid, comfort, and no doubt a big laugh to the totalitarians in Moscow. Our enemies. Bad guys. We spend billions arming ourselves against them. We don't owe them a free lunch, even if it's grown in Kansas.

So, Mr. Reagan, when Mr. Dole comes around pleading for another subsidized sale—corn, maybe, or soybeans—remember what your wife tells teenagers tempted by drugs. *Just say no.* Don't listen when Vin Weber tells you "everybody's doing it." That doesn't make it right. You expect teenagers to withstand peer pressure. And you should, too. ☐

## Speak German like a Diplomat!

What sort of people need to learn a foreign language as quickly and effectively as possible? *Foreign service personnel*, that's who.

**Now you can learn to speak German with the same materials used by the U.S. State Department**—the Foreign Service Institute's *Programmed Introduction to German*.

The FSI spent thousands of dollars and many years developing these materials for use by members of the United States diplomatic corps. Today people in all walks of life who need to learn to speak a foreign language are turning to this outstanding audio program.

The FSI's German Course is by far *the most effective way* to learn German at your own convenience and pace. It consists of a series of cassettes, recorded by native German speakers, and accompanying textbook. You simply follow the spoken and written instructions, listening and learning. By the end of the course you'll find yourself learning and speaking entirely in German!

**This course turns your cassette player into a "teaching machine."** With its unique "programmed" learning method, you set your own pace—testing yourself, correcting errors, reinforcing accurate responses.

This FSI Programmed Course comes in two volumes, each shipped in a handsome library binder. Order either, or save 10% by ordering both:

- ☐ **Volume I. Programmed Introduction to German**, 10 cassettes (13 hr.), and 647-p. text, \$135.
- ☐ **Volume II. Basic Course Continued**, 8 cassettes, (8 hr.), and 179-p. text, \$120. (CT residents add sales tax.)

**TO ORDER BY PHONE, PLEASE CALL TOLL-FREE NUMBER: 1-800-243-1234.**

To order by mail, clip this ad and send with your name and address, and a check or money order—or charge to your credit card (VISA, MasterCard, AmEx, Diners) by enclosing card number, expiration date, and your signature.


**The Foreign Service Institute's German Course is unconditionally guaranteed.** Try it for three weeks. If you're not convinced it's the fastest, easiest, most painless way to learn German, return it and we'll refund every penny you paid. Order today!

120 courses in 41 other languages also available. Write us for free catalog. Our 12th year.

Audio-Forum  
Room 826  
On-The-Green,  
Guilford, CT 06437  
(203) 453-9794 DNB



### AUDIO-FORUM®



**"Taxation and the Deficit Economy is essential reading for anyone seriously interested in reforming our economic policies."**

—JAMES C. MILLER III, Director  
Office of Management and Budget

**TAXATION AND THE DEFICIT ECONOMY**  
Fiscal Policy and Capital Formation in the United States

Edited by DWIGHT R. LEE  
Foreword by MICHAEL J. BOSKIN

**T**wenty-two distinguished economists examine the harmful effects of taxation on personal and corporate income; the deleterious impact of welfare programs, Social Security, and military spending on capital formation; and the special political and bureaucratic interests that dominate the fiscal process. Proposals for reform include stringent constraints on the fiscal process, economic deregulation, tax reduction and simplification, and reductions in both transfer payments and military spending.

530 pages; paper, \$14.95;  
cloth, \$34.95

Available at bookstores

**PACIFIC INSTITUTE**

FOR PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH  
177 Post Street, Dept. 2, San Francisco, CA 94108


# brickbats

**T**he aesthetic sensibilities of Lakeside Park, Kentucky, residents were apparently deeply offended by 13-year-old Jeffrey Kisor's tree house. The city council voted that it must be torn down because an ordinance prohibits such detached structures. "I think the city is weird to say I have to get rid of it," says the young anarchist. "It's in my own yard and my own tree." Jeffrey's father hasn't given up yet. He says he might run wooden beams from the tree house to his house—a distance of 50 feet—thus technically attaching the structure to the house. It won't look very pretty, but it will meet the letter of the law.

**T**wo Atlantic City casinos in the middle of an advertising war over which offers the best odds to gamblers have been told by New Jersey officials to cease the promotional campaigns. Harrah's Marina Hotel claims that its slot machines paid out the most overall in recent months, while Trump's Castle counters that Harrah's players lost more overall. Neither claim is in dispute, apparently because Harrah's overall slot-machine volume is greater than that of other casinos. So what's the problem? The casinos violated a law that prohibits advertising the odds of games. Hmm—maybe the state doesn't want people to know casinos offer better odds than its lottery.

**Y**ou know the old dean's tale, misery loves company? It's now the University of California's official policy that students display sympathy for the have-nots. Every undergraduate student is now required to participate in the Human Corps, a program to promote "the ethics of public service" by foisting 19-year-olds on the populace to fight illiteracy, environmental contamination, inadequate housing, etc. The student whose heart bleeds the most gets an A?

**T**ake pity on Joseph Mauri, an unemployed outcast and victim of cruel American capitalism. At least that's what Mauri and the Soviets would like us to believe. Mauri, the subject of a Soviet propaganda film on America's poor and homeless, claims



"LOST?! WELL, DON'T JUST STAND THERE! RUN DOWN TO A TOY STORE!"

he was evicted from his New York apartment last year by a heartless landlady who wanted a sewing room. The poor lad says he supports himself by doing odd jobs and now lives in a hotel room paid for by friends. But the Soviets got caught red-faced on this one. "Homeless" Mauri in fact has two homes in New York, one a rent-stabilized apartment and the other a hotel room subsidized by the taxpayers. And Mauri has a job as a substitute mailroom worker at the *New York Times* that could pay him over \$35,000 a year. But Mauri doesn't bother to show up. No doubt he'll consider all offers of employment once he returns from his expense-paid tour of Mother Russia.

**I**s little Niels Hoven white or Oriental? In our quota-conscious age, it makes a big difference. Or does it? When John and Sue Hoven decided that their son needed special reading, math, and science classes, they asked their Maryland school board for permission to transfer him to another elementary school. Because John is white and Sue is Asian, Niels is classified as a minority student. Good? No, bad. There were already

too many minorities at the school he wanted to go to. Yet being "white" wouldn't have helped, either. That would have prevented Niels from transferring out of his current school. Why? There are too few white students there.

**S**chizophrenia is alive and well in New Jersey. A task force to eliminate paperwork in state government has been trashed because it wasn't submitting enough reports. The paperwork management task force saved the state \$5.5 million in two years by reducing the number of forms in various departments. For example, the group found there were 30 different forms and 15 different publications for new employees explaining benefits, lunch hours, ethics, etc. The task force designed one brochure and one form for all state employees. But the group was "too independent," says budget director Richard B. Standiford. "We needed reports from them... to make sure there is no duplication." Was the team disbanded because they didn't produce enough paper? "Well, I wouldn't put it quite that way," he demurs.

—Mark Edward Crane