Steve Solnick

Carter assures ‘unity’ inhibits free speech

Not since Vietnam in its darkest days has crises in foreign affairs thrust upon us and, in many ways, disturbing impact on American domestic politics. Following the collapse of last night’s low-cost, low-potential, President Carter has benefited from the disasters in Iran and Afghanistan, by staging a political comeback that would have left even Lazarus jealous. Yet that spectacular rebirth in the polls has not been achieved without a rather insidious manipulation of some lofty ideals in the debate on patriotism, national unity, and non-partisanship.

Millions stormed the American embassy in Tehran on November 4, the entire Presidential campaign was thrown quickly into limbo. Suddenly, the buzzwords of the hour were patience and national unity. Right would prevail, we were told, if only we could stick together and show the internal strength that makes America great. The resulting wave of patriotic fervor following Carter’s 1976 campaign pledge to unite the nation or any of the dozen of his favored cardigan-clad dogs could ever hope to.

Carter moves slowly

Then, unnaturally, things started to drag. It became clear that our foes were not only holding strong cards, but they were also making up the ranks of the Gestapo. Carter’s actions have many ways, tentative: One painstakingly waited for a strong and unequivocal international mandate before taking actions to recovery our own embassies and property.

In December, Carter ordered most of the Iranian diplomatic personnel out of the U.S. Strong stuff. But, according to reporters for the Hearst Syndicate, 13 days after the order was issued, no Iranians had left. Why not, you ask? Because many had become naturalized citizens and could not be expelled. Our declaration forced them to leave but the State Department was unsure just whom the order was aimed at.

Then, after the Soviet veto of economic sanctions on Iran in the Security Council, the Carter administration declared it would act as if the resolution were adopted and was "preparing to impose a limited embargo." Why then, was it asked, did we delay the imposition of this embargo throughout the month-long UN debate if we intended to impose sanctions anyway"? The Security Council could have been used to gain support from other countries.

Open debate needed

Where, you wonder, might the criticism, or at least the discussion, of Carter’s conduct in this election year? Nowhere. Because, plainly, Carter has turned any criticism of his actions in this crisis into an open debate of it — into an act of saerilege. "We must speak with one voice," he declared, and Presidential candidates agreed to treat the subject as a sacred cow. They all declared that "non-political." And any voice but Carter’s was obviously political. Even Ted Kennedy’s labelling the Shah a "dictator" was now just as necessary to deal with the Russian invasion.

The breakthrough in recombinant DNA technology is a clear reminder that science and engineering may potentially either enhance and condition, alternatively, pose a serious threat to mankind.

Long subject of controversy, recombinant DNA research has been extensively debated. Much of the publicity surrounding the research pointed to the remote possibility that the gene-splicing procedure may create entirely new and deadly microorganisms which could cause widespread epidemics. Even medical professionals were not prepared to accept that the fruits of this research might be used to unlock the door to a new generation of bioweapons.

"We must speak with one voice," he declared, and Presidential candidates agreed to treat the subject as a sacred cow. They all declared that "non-political." And any voice but Carter’s was obviously political. Even Ted Kennedy’s labelling the Shah a "dictator" was now just as necessary to deal with the Russian invasion.

In the words of both William Safire and Arthur Schlesinger, samples of recombinant DNA are "unpatriotic." Now really. Such talk may be politically motivated but it makes sense in Iran as well.

Kennedy unapologetic

Finally, though, the Republicans got restless. Republican National Chairman Bill Brock declared it was "gloves off on Iran.'" Critics of Carter’s tepid-toe tactics — which have once made sense in Iran as a way of convincing angry mobs we were a united people — was now just as necessary to deal with the Russian invasion. Somehow the two stand in one. But it was Kennedy once again who learned the hard way as criticism of the Iranian embassy was branded "unpatriotic." Now really. Such talk may be politically motivated but it would take the likes of Benedict Arnold to truly deserve being Presidential — branded "unpatriotic." We have here no denunciation of the war in Vietnam, no criticism of the Vietnam veterans action.

To sum up or the other Presidential candidates will remember that it’s okay to talk about the "now" as well as the last three years. President Carter is now drafting a new "doctrine" to combat foreign aggression. He is turning to the Russians in the debate on American hostages in Iran and Russian invaders in Afghanistan will only be compensated for by a strong, coherent set of tactics. Silence in an election year will penalize us. We will not let the crisis "unite" behind the Carter Doctrine check their discussion of it, whether they support it or not.

Perhaps, instead. President Carter may just consider it more "patriotic" to postpone the election a few years, until the foreign policy mess is digested — for better or worse.

Ken Hamilton

Values: Oriented Science

Biogen, S.A., a small scientific research company, succeeded in proving a theory of the human body’s most important disease fighting substance, interferon, is in fact, the "X" factor. The breakthrough in recombinant DNA technology is a clear reminder that science and engineering may potentially either enhance and condition, alternatively, pose a serious threat to mankind.

The recent rise in educate the production of interferon, a substance used by human cells to fight viral diseases and cancer. Conventional methods employed to isolate the substance are prohibitively expensive, but the new technology may allow inexpensive large scale production. Other dramatic possibilities include the use of bacteria to produce insulin, new methods for making antibiotics and other therapeutic molecules, and bacterial production of ethyl alcohol for use in gasohol.

To too scientists work in a classically objective, value-free, impersonal vacuum despite applied science does have ethical implications. In the preface of this book, we see that describing harm to human beings, and beauty in its theory, to apply good science implies the existence of both good and bad science, that some ways of practicing science may better describe harmony and order, express truth, harmony, and beauty in its theory.

Science is a way of knowing the world as it is. In his book, "The Concept of Science," Loren Eiseley says, "and what we find is the technology that springs from good science is likely to be better for the rest of the world too.

We should restate, if this is a different kind of science than value-free science. This different path of objective may very well lead to (Please turn page for)
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