Column/Thomas T. Huang

A weekend runner confronts The Wall

As you stagger into Boston, the crowds are all but gone. Occasionally, a brick wall blocks your way. You're near Kenmore Square and the Clarks Inn. Some University students were from their high- school teams; they don't know that you're in pals. You look back at them.

You remember the man who sat in front of you on the bus to Hopkinton, MA. Last year, I was running six-motion miles all the way to Heartbreak Hill," he had said. "Then I hit The Wall." You wondered what The Wall was. Well, now you know.

Earlier, before the marathon started, you had heard tales of a lot of strange things.

On a cool, rainy Patriot's Day, the early morning fog slowly lifted. You saw the green grasses and the early morning fog slowly lifted. The day was over, but you hadn't run yet. You looked around at your fellow runners. Some people run for the fame, while others just want to finish. You were here because of alcohol. For it was three days earlier, Friday night, after three or four beers, that Gelman had said, "Why don't we run the marathon?"

"What are you seniles? This might be the last time you ever get the chance to participate in such a hallowed event. Don't think too hard about the fact that you had only started your annual running kick only three weekends before. As Saul Bellow once said: "Here the deed." So that weekend, you started carbo-loading, eating spaghetti and feta cheese and lying in bed and buying yourselves fancy running shoes and gorging yourself on donuts on the day." You knew that this was all nonsense, though you were going to die on the running course somewhere near Braintree or Natick or Wellesley, you made all the hazy preparations anyway, in order to get as much of the energy that had become the media event. The atmosphere of the marathon was something that's counted.

(Please turn to page 5)

Deutch's view of SDI flawed

To the Editor:

I am writing in response to a recent article in The Tech ("Deutch urges policy of deterrence"). Marc Acocella's article states that Deutch believes "SDI is based on two concepts: nuclear deterrence and national security against nuclear weapons..." This is a serious misrepresentation of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). Deutch is paraphrased as saying that "SDI will not be survivable against an invader's enemy." This statement is analogous to saying that fighters and bombers cannot survive because of the increased sophistication of anti-aircraft or aircraft systems. If a warhead was destroyed by counter-aircraft or counter-aircraft systems, that warhead could not have been used.

Marc Acocella's article cites the cost of $2 billion per year to operate SDI. This is incorrect. SDI is based on two concepts: nuclear deterrence and national security against nuclear weapons. However, after all, offensive weapons are of little use if they are destroyed before they can be used. Deutch and the American public must certainly realize that the credibility of our deterrent force can be based upon the ability of our offensive weapons to exact a high toll on the enemy's forces. This brings up the need for an extensive SDI program in the USSR -- a program which our news media seems to have little interest in acknowledging or researching.

Since the early 1960s, the USSR has been researching high-energy lasers and particle beam weapons; in fact, in the period since 1975 the Kremlin has spent more on strategic air defenses than on offensive nuclear forces. Acocella claims that Dr. Rolf A. Dumas has called this a "sensible option." Acocella also attributes a "balanced, responsible" view of SDI to Deutch. Acocella's claims that SDI will be able to provide a new defense is not substantiated by any objective research. The issue is to be considered, not avoided.

I believe that Deutch urges the policy of deterrence. However, Acocella's statement that Deutch is urging a "violent" option is inaccurate. Deutch urges a policy of deterrence, not aggressive deterrence. The issue is to be considered, not avoided.

I believe that the Soviet Union has spent $150 billion on its own version of SDI research. This is based on two concepts: nuclear deterrence and national security against nuclear weapons. However, after all, offensive weapons are of little use if they are destroyed before they can be used. Deutch and the American public must certainly realize that the credibility of our deterrent force can be based upon the ability of our offensive weapons to exact a high toll on the enemy's forces. This brings up the need for an extensive SDI program in the USSR -- a program which our news media seems to have little interest in acknowledging or researching.

The issue is to be considered, not avoided.

S. S. Mills

CROWD DISAGREED WITH SDSI VIEW ON SDI

To the Editor:

Aubie Merchant's report on President John M. Deutch's meeting with the members of Green Action said that the position of "Deutch urges policy of deterrence" is not supported by the United States as espoused by Deutch. The issue -- threaten or be threatened -- is an issue of one's enemies is inheritably dangerous.

Since the early 1960s, the USSR has been researching high-energy lasers and particle beam weapons; in fact, in the period since 1975 the Kremlin has spent more on strategic air defenses than on offensive nuclear forces. Acocella claims that Dr. Rolf A. Dumas has called this a "sensible option." Acocella also attributes a "balanced, responsible" view of SDI to Deutch. Acocella's claims that SDI will be able to provide a new defense is not substantiated by any objective research. The issue is to be considered, not avoided.

I believe that the Soviet Union has spent $150 billion on its own version of SDI research. This is based on two concepts: nuclear deterrence and national security against nuclear weapons. However, after all, offensive weapons are of little use if they are destroyed before they can be used. Deutch and the American public must certainly realize that the credibility of our deterrent force can be based upon the ability of our offensive weapons to exact a high toll on the enemy's forces. This brings up the need for an extensive SDI program in the USSR -- a program which our news media seems to have little interest in acknowledging or researching.

The issue is to be considered, not avoided.

S. S. Mills

Arrested student resembles suspect

To the Editor:

I would like to discuss the accusation made by Stephen Fernando '86 in his letter on racial harassment. "Our Nationality account CJs of racial harassment," April 7. It seems that Fernando is haras- sing from severe paranoia delusions. He believes that most whites and many minorities are being treated in a manner against him, and he contacts all these events with his own imagination. When the police stopped him and asked for identification, Fernando claimed it was obviously because of his race, not because of his behavior.

20 witnesses had just identified him as a suspect of a rather major crime. When he was arrested and taken away, he felt this was because of his race, and not his role in the investigation of a crime. Fernando's belief that the Truman administration was the campus Police was the reason that he was not at the scene was questioned, but he was the only one who searched the hall. Finally, his own assertion that he is a member of the police force is not true. In general, it is not wise for the victim of a crime to per- sonally discuss matters with a suspected criminal while deciding whether or not to report the sus- pect to the police. It is not particularly healthy, nor is it a wise idea to produce much reliable information.

If there is any discrimination going on here, it is against people who happen to be re- publicans and to judge the
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