



Daniel Jeremy Silver Collection Digitization Project

Featuring collections from the Western Reserve Historical Society and
The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives

MS-4850: Daniel Jeremy Silver Papers, 1972-1993.

Series III: The Temple Tifereth-Israel, 1946-1993, undated.

Sub-series B: Sermons, 1950-1989, undated.

Reel
64

Box
20

Folder
1304

Star Wars and Other Lethal Games, 1985.

STAR WARS AND OTHER GAMES -
IS ARMS CONTROL POSSIBLE?
Daniel Jeremy Silver
October 27, 1985

On the 19th and 20th of November, just a bit more than three weeks from now, Nikolai Gorbachev, the first Secretary of the Soviet Union, and our President will meet at Geneva. They, their senior staff and hundreds of security people will descend on that city and they will be followed there by thousands of representatives of the world's press. The world is eager, passionately anxious, to hear whatever can be heard of the results of the meeting of these two leaders of the so-called super powers. This summit meeting is an Event with a capital E. Rightly or wrongly, the world associates the meeting of the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States with the freighted question of the survival of civilization.

In many ways the attention given to this bi-lateral meeting is somewhat anachronistic. Over the last three decades power has become increasingly diffused. In the 1950's when the President of the United States and the Chairman of the Soviet Union met, those two men held a monopoly of power in their hands. Over the last three decades all this has changed. France has gone its own way in the west. China has gone its own way in the east. The economic power of the OPEC nations has made itself felt. The NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries have become increasingly restive under the authority of their patrons. The so-called Third World has carved out an independent foreign policy. Terrorism has been in force. The United States lost a war in southeast Asia and the Soviet Union is unable to win a war in Afghanistan. During the last few months we have seen that neither super power can fully protect its own diplomats from kidnapping and assassination in a non-country

such as the Lebanon.

What remains of the power of the super powers is largely in the realm of the nuclear, the power to blot out life. But even in the area of nuclear power, there has been diffusion. England has its own nuclear force. France has its own nuclear force. So does China. So does India. Pakistan and a number of other nations will soon join the club. But none of these forces, singly or together, begins to rival the power which the Soviet and the American leader could unleash. They are the only two leaders who can create nuclear winter.

This world is interested in this Summit less in the long laundry list of issues, but in a single issue: the issue of arms control, nuclear arms control. I often feel that this preoccupation with the issue of arms limitation and arms control is misguided. The issue of nuclear warfare is not limited to the possibility of such warfare between the super powers. Think of what might have happened in the Iraqi-Iranian war if Israel had not knocked out the French-built atomic reactor in Iraq. Imagine what will happen when a rogue nation such as Libya gains control of nuclear weapons.

All those reporters are at Geneva because the citizens of Paris, London, Warsaw and Bombay are desperately concerned that the two major world powers may not be able to co-exist without precipitating a nuclear holocaust.

The degree of world preoccupation became clear to me over the last two weeks which I spent in Europe. The European press was full of articles which focused on the arms issue almost to the

exclusion of all else. And perhaps the most dramatic illustration of this fact were the reports which followed the presentation by our own President at the United Nations just this week at the 40th anniversary of that body. You recall he made there a speech in which he spoke not so much of arms limitations, he referred to arms control talks only in passing, but he focused on the need to develop regional meetings to adjudicate the issues that might arise between the great powers, in Latin America, in the Near East, Africa and elsewhere in the world. And on the day following I picked up the rather conservative financial Times of London and I found there the President's speech headlined in this way: Mr. Reagan Fails To



respond. And the article went on to say he failed to respond to the various initiatives which Mihail Gorbechev has offered in terms of arms limitations over the past few weeks. And Lemonde, the Parisian newspaper, headlined its editorial with these words: A Mischance. The President failed to respond to the issues that they wanted the President to address.

Now, President Reagan's explanations of his stance begin with the statement, and there's a great deal of truth to it, that serious negotiations belong at the negotiating table, that you can't negotiate complicated, sophisticated issues involving technology and matters which are militarily secret in the public press. It may also reflect the fact that the American administration seems not yet to have worked out within itself a single policy as far as what it is prepared to do in the area of arms control and arms limitation at Geneva. But the President went on to say some things which I find to be valid, and I hope he meant it in the same way I have taken it, when he said in his speech a week ago Saturday over the radio and repeated it in another form at the United Nations. he said that Saturday alst: "True peace must be based on more than just the reducing the means of waging war. It must address the forces of tension and provoke man to take up arms." In other words, the President is saying that by themselves arms controls, arms limitations, will not achieve or assure peace.

Imagine, if you will, that this summit meeting in November might quickly lead to negotiations at Geneva and the arms talks between the two major powers which would eventuate in a 50 percent reduction in all nuclear arms of all categories by these two powers.

That would be an amazing achievement, one, I'm sure, beyond the realm of possibility. But let's assume for the point of argument that Mr. Gorbachev and Mr. Reagan were able to set in motion the negotiations which would achieve that end. Would that treaty being signed would the world be a more peaceful place? Would you and I be more secure? The Soviet Union and the United States would still have each over 500 intercontinental ballistic missiles capable of bringing death and destruction to the other country. Each of us would have over 3,000 nuclear warheads to deliver directly against the other country. Each of us would have a very sophisticated means of launching these missiles from submarine, from bombers, and from land-based silos. We would have, in other words, an arsenal, a remaining arsenal sufficient to blot out life on the face of the earth several times over.

Arms limitations by themselves with the link missing element in this equation which is trust between the major powers; without trust all any arms limitation group really is is a limitation of the cost of armament by the two powers that are involved. No country, not trusting other countries, would willingly diminish its ability to defend itself to respond to attack. And so if we look at SALT I, the first strategic arms limitation treaty, or SALT II, the second strategic arms limitation treaty, we find in both cases though there were limitations in both cases, at the end of the initial term of the treaty both arsenals, that of the Soviet Union and that of the United States, had greater destructive power than they had before those treaties were brought into effect.

Look at it another way. There ^{were} over 100,000 weapon-related deaths in this world in the last twelve months, none of them

directly related to a nuclear explosion; the Iraq-Iranian war, the warwar in Angola, the fighting in Cambodia, the fighting between Eritrea and Ethiopia, the fighting in North Ireland, the fighting in Latin America. A hundred thousand earthlings lost their lives to weapons that are non-nuclear in just the last twelve months. Would an arms limitation treaty of magnificent proportions, if it were achieved at Geneva, diminish these deaths, or, more importantly, would they take a step in the direction of reducing the tensions, the anger, the frustration, the want, the greed, which precipitates the kind of battles we have been describing?

If we want peace in our world we need not only arms control but poverty control. We need not only arms control but population control. We need not only arms control but terrorism control. We need not only arms control but human rights controls. We need not only arms control but illiteracy controls. We need to solve the underlying causes, tension, anger, frustration, war, and that, of course, is no easy task.

What I'm saying is that in many ways our President is right when he tries to remind the world that despite our overriding and understandable concern with destruction, the suicide of an atomic or nuclear war, that if we focus all of our concerns just at that level, we will fail to address the issues which will ultimately catalyze a nuclear conflict. the issues are many and they are varied, and all the items which are on the summit's agenda, whether they be items dealing with trade or the rights of the various air carriers to land in one country or another on one level; whether it concerns that each country should understand what it considers its sphere of influence and how it will exert itself, elbow itself

into privileged conditions in that sphere of influence; whether it wants to make sure that the other country understands what it will tolerate and what it will not tolerate in that sphere of influence; all the issues which the summit will deal with in one form or another involve the question of peace and security, not simply that of arms control and of arms limitation however important those kinds of negotiations in fact may be.

It's interesting, too, when we look at the preparations, the propaganda preparations for the summit meeting, how different the approach of the two super powers has been to the questions that are at issue. The Soviet Union has concentrated entirely on arms control and arms limitation. Mikhail Gorbachev has made some very interesting proposals having to do with significant reductions of intermediate range missiles, having to do with withdrawal of certain range missiles from the Warsaw Pact countries back into the Soviet Union, having to do with even a reduction of strategic weapons between the two countries. The United States has countered these proposals in a negative fashion. It has pointed out to the advantage each was designed to gain for the Soviet Union, but what's interesting is not so much the initial negotiating proposals which Gorbachev has made but the fact that the entire propaganda policy bureau activity of the Soviet Union has been geared to focus the world on what the world is already focused on, arms control, arms limitations. Why? Because in this area the Soviet Union can say, look, we offered, this is the issue, here are your concerns, and now forget about what's happening over here, forget about our support for the Cuban troops in Angola, forget about the poison gas that is being used in Afghanistan, forget about the support of a

reactionary and vicious government in Cambodia, forget about the gun ship helicopters we have sent to Nicaragua, that's irrelevant, the issue is peace, the issue is arms control and here we are and we have much to offer.

And the United States, I must confess, has been remarkably heavy-handed in responding to this approach. Our President who seems to usually have almost a genius for understanding what must be said and how to say it has seen his genius entirely desert him in this respect. The public pronouncements of the United States have been negative, that is, they've played up problems in the Soviet proposal. They have been limited, and when the President has tried to focus the attention of the world on other sets of issues, on the flash points in the Near East and Latin America and elsewhere, he has failed to come up with any constructive, imaginative suggestions. He's been more preachy than diplomatic. Why could not this administration come forward a week ago, a month ago, with a dramatic proposal, here's what we offer, we, too, are willing to reduce our nuclear arsenal; how many times over must the world be destroyed. Given our sophisticated forms of knowing what's happening in other countries, isn't it possible to devise almost fool-proof ways to know that if we take out of commission x number of missiles, the Soviet Union will in fact follow and do the same? But our government has not been forthcoming and so Mr. Gorbachev, being a rather new face in the international sphere, being much younger than his predecessors, being a more urbane and sophisticated man, has been able to command center stage and to command a lot of attention. He gained a lot of points for the Soviet Union because the world is preoccupied with the nuclear issue and because he seems to be offering some solution,

some progress in that kind of arena.

Mr. Reagan has let himself be painted into a corner as a heavy, as the belligerent one, in part because we have not been forthcoming in these immediate weeks before the summit meeting, but in part also because of what is called the strategic defense initiative, star wars. In March of 1983, March 4 to be exact, in a speech which Mr. Reagan gave on science and the national defense, in his usual, rather simple, down-to-earth way, he seemed to offer to the American people and to the world a way out of being hostaged to the bomb. Ever since the nuclear age began, the basic theory of the armaments race, if an armaments race can be said to have a theory, has been appropriately called MAD, mutual assured deterrence. Now, madness it is because MAD assumes that such peace as we have in the world exists only because any nation, any nuclear nation, knows that if it launches a surprise attack, a first strike on the other nation, that technology and the armament of that other nation is capable of instantaneous, complete and assured response, that the nation which launches the first strike will gain no advantage from that strike because it will destroy the country which it has attacked, but it will in turn be destroyed by the automatic response of the enemy. We have submarines deep in the ocean. We have planes flying in the air at all times. We have missiles ready on their silos who are controlled by a very sophisticated electronic system which, within a matter of a minute or two of the knowledge of a launch, an attack on the United States, will automatically launch at pre-determined targets within the Soviet Union and effectively destroy anything which we might call civilized life in that country - mutual assured destruction - means simply what we all know it to mean, that

we enjoy the sunshine and the cool beauty of this lovely autumn day as hostages, as hostages to a decision which be being made at this moment someplace else for whatever reason, hostages perhaps simply to the malfunctioning of the electronic system in another country's weapon rooms and that in a matter of moments all that we cherish might be cindered. That's madness - mutual assured destruction.

Now, in March of 1983 President Reagan offered the United States, offered us, in a sense the world, a different doctrine. Instead of madness, mutual assured destruction, he offered us assured security. He offered the possibility of a shield, a technologically advanced shield which would stop enemy missiles from penetrating the air space of our country which would shoot them down before they had a chance to be triggered off which would protect us from attack. He offered us a world where we would no longer be hostage to the actions of others but could truly create a stable, secure defense for ourselves. What he spoke, if free people could live secure in the knowledge that their security does not rest on instant U.S. retaliation to deter Soviet attack, but if we could intercept and destroy strategic ballistic missiles before they reached our own soil or that of our allies. Now, the response of the Soviet Union to this strategic defense initiative was instantaneous, angry, bitter. Within four days Mr. Andropov who was then the senior official of the Soviet Union, had accused the United States of trying to set aside the Soviet weaponry and to minimize its importance and to undo the mad basis of our security. And the world has ever since looked upon Star Wars as if it were a major new escalation by the United States of the nuclear arms race. In point of fact, whatever it may be or may not be, it is not new. In the second World War there were all

kinds of attempts by countries to defend themselves against attack from the air: anti-aircraft weapons, fighter bombers and the like. After the war, as the nuclear age began, both the Soviet Union and the United States began to experiment with what they call ballistic missile defense, anti-ballistic missiles, various ways in which we presumably could shoot down a missile which was traveling at a target within our own country. And by the early 1950's there were rudimentary anti-ballistic missiles in place. The Soviet Union had begun, in fact, to place around both Leningrad and Moscow an anti-ballistic defense system. Research and development on these anti-ballistic missiles proceeded during the 1950's. Both military commands spoke openly of the need to develop a ballistic missile defense. As early as 1962 Mr. Krushchev, with his usual command of the vivid phrase, said that the Soviet Union now had the ability to knock down a fly in space, one of its missiles. But as the sixties progressed and as research and development further explored the area of anti-ballistic missiles and a nuclear defense, star wars if you will, it became more and more apparent to both countries that given the level of technology of the times, the investment that they would make in the hardware as well as in certain kinds of research in this area, was not worth the benefit that would come of it. And so in 1972 an anti-ballistic missile treaty was signed between the Soviet Union and the United States which prohibited the further emplacement of anti-ballistic missiles and which set rigid limits upon further research and development in the anti-ballistic area.

Now, the problem, of course is, was, that neither country abided by those research and development limitations. Since the

very beginning we've been able to observe many of these developments because our space program was the beginning of an attempt to create a new level of defense as well as, perhaps, a new level of attack. We've come to think of the space program in the United States as scientifically based. The press has given us wonderful diagrams and pictures and coverage of the various missiles that have gone up and taken up pay loads, satellites which are going to investigate the rings of Saturn, the atmosphere of Jupiter, the nature of outer space, but the real thrust of the space program both in the Soviet Union and in the United States has been, from the beginning, its military purpose. What is its military purpose? In the first instance, to put into space investigative, sophisticated, electronic equipment which can pinpoint targets in the other country and which can watch what's happening there and give intelligence reports so that neither country will be surprised by the actions of the other. And these components are now highly sophisticated so that the United States and the Soviet Union know exactly when troop movements take place, whether missiles moved from one silo to another, when a new silo is dug, what is placed in that silo and the like. The space program also involved communications, instantaneous control of the whole missile system of the other country, and it also involved the putting into space of platforms, space ships, space shuttles if you will, platforms which ultimately can be used to in place guns of one kind or another which can be directed at the enemy. And the basis of the star wars science fiction, and it is not science fiction, science fiction possibility, is the placement of these space platforms over the other country, the placing on them of electronically con-

trolled, highly sophisticated laser and electromagnetic pulse weapons whose missiles travel at or near the speed of light, weapons which can in fact home in on and hit a Soviet missile within a minute or two of its launch because of the speed at which they are controlled and travel, long before it is armed and triggered, prepared even to enter its orbit for attack upon the United States or, in the case of the United States, the Soviet space platform on the Soviet Union.

And so when the President spoke again in 1983 of ballistic missile defense, he spoke now after twenty more years of sophisticated research and development, when in point of fact there is the possibility of such a defense, and he spoke in terms which seemed to promise the American people a freedom from fear and anxiety which were not known since the beginning of the nuclear age.

Now, the strategic defense initiative is possible. The science, apparently, is do-able. The cost is horrible, hundreds of billions of dollars over the next two decades or more. The question, however, that must be faced is whether or not this is a contribution to stability, security; whether it will work even when all the highly technical gadgets and controls are in place. The Soviet Union reacted bitterly and angrily. One is not quite sure why. because the Soviet Union has in fact continued research and development in this area over the last thirty years. Its space platforms are as sophisticated as our own. It has apparently built deep in the bowels of Siberia a major electronic command station whose purpose seems to be to be able to control these kinds of space vehicles and space weaponry, so it is not that it is innocence and suddenly found that the United States has moved ahead of it in a major area.

Some have argued that Mr. Gorbechov, representing a new generation of Soviet leaders, is more interested in solving the serious problems of the Soviet economy than of committing hundreds of billions of dollars into further defense costs. All that may be true. But what is probably equally true is that the Soviet Union fears that under some kind of feeling of protection someone in the United States may feel that in fact a successful war can be launched against the Soviet Union, that we no longer need to feel that we will be utterly obliterated if we launch such a war. And if a General Patton type becomes the man who is at the command on that particular day, a war of this kind might in fact be launched and, of course, the same logic applies by the United States theoreticians as they analyze the Soviet Union.

It's a very, very unhappy thought and as an historian I keep thinking of all those desperate attempts that people have made over the centuries to give themselves assured security. You travel in Europe, and what do you see? You see those great high castle walls, massive stone blocks raised two, three stories high. These were to be the assured security of the citizens of that city, but always someone found a way to build a battering ram which could batter through the gate, to sap under the wall, to come in within the city, to use slingshots to hurl the weapons above the wall. If you look back over history you'll find again and again and again leaders promising their people that they have assured security when in fact that security is not assured and cannot be assured. And the one thing that is certain as you think about this strategic defense initiative is that both countries will immediately put to work not

only the scientists who will devise the weapons which can shoot down the missiles but scientists who will devise weapons which can not be shot down by the weapons that are now designed to shoot down the missiles. To every action there is an equal reaction, so Mr. Reagan, I'm afraid, was, as he often does, mis-speaking or, rather, when he was holding out to us a promise, an alluring promise which no one can guarantee to us, and a promise which will be terribly costly to the coffers of all countries because not only will the Soviet Union and the United States have to begin to compete in this new area but all members of the nuclear club if they want to stay as effective powers in the world. And truly, truly, there is a limit. There is a limit to what any country can spend without destroying itself from within.

How many schools, how many hospitals, how many welfare programs, how many decent apartments and living places have we shot up purposely into space? And what we have done has been done by every other country in the world. How long can the economy of the world maintain any degree of prosperity, provide for the four billion earthlings who are now here if we continue to increase the percentage of the world's gross national product which is spent for armament, how long?

Now, in all probability some arrangement will be made, beginning at the summit meeting and being carried out into the negotiations which will succeed it at the arms control negotiations, which will limit the research and development of this new strategic defense initiative rather rigidly, but I assure you it will proceed. It will proceed because neither country trusts the other because the world of the nation-states in competition is a jungle full of

predators, no one trusting the other - none.

I wish I were more sanguine, but I look at my own country. The world is a jungle. We have our problems. There is a good degree of violence in our country, but it doesn't compare to the nuclear arsenals which are out there. We have a police force which is controlled by civilians. We have laws and we have courts and yet I note, and I remind you, that every recent effort to take away the armaments with which Americans are trying to protect their homes have failed. Every attempt at gun control made in the last 35 or 40 years has failed. If we cannot disarm ourselves within a society of laws, how can we expect the lawless society of the nation-states to begin a meaningful program of disarmament? Now, we know, do we not, that when we take a gun into our home we don't increase the protection of our home, we increase the danger within the home. The gun can be used and nine times out of ten the gun will harm a member of the home, not somebody coming in from outside. We know that. The statistics prove it and yet, at the end of every year there are more guns in American hands and homes than at the beginning of that year.

We want peace. We want it desperately. I would ask for the hope that we focus not simply on arms limitations agreements, the sophisticated and complicated agreements which are largely attempts to somehow restrain the cost a bit of the armaments race. Perhaps those agreements buy us a little time, but that we become concerned with all the other myriads of issues which create the tensions and the frustrations and the angers and bitterness which walls our world. Arms control must be complemented with poverty control and illiteracy

countries there are millions of us who are concerned about peace, but until we go beyond this concern with the negotiations and deal

control and population control, terrorism control and human rights control, all of these things.

The Hebrew word for peace you all know - shalom. What you may not know is that the Hebrew word was originally the name of a Canaanite goddess, Shalum, the goddess of the moon. I've always felt that the word shalom, which contains within itself a sense of completion, of slowly coming into complete form the full moon, the moon which is completely round and which could not be other than it is, that that natural object was chosen because it begins as a sliver and slowly, night by night, as the month progresses, develops into its fullness. If we want the fullness of peace, the road to peace will not be one assured, up here, by simply trying to find some kind of magic negotiations which will create arms limitation agreements. Nothing much will be achieved but the gaining of some time, but if bit by bit in our homes, in our schools, in our relationships between people, we learn to share, to live together, to create an international society of law, to limit the arbitrary power of the nation-state to act as it will without thought to the world interest, if we begin the long, difficult, arduous process of building completion, of building peace. The captains and the kings will retire from Geneva after the 20th of November. The press will total up the event and tell us as if it were a football score, you know, who won and who scored how many points. We may in fact find that the leaders may develop a framework of some kind of arms agreement, minimal though it may be, because both of them have a constituency, the eastern bloc, the NATO bloc, which is crying out for some relief from the arms race because in both countries there are millions of us who are concerned about peace, but until we go beyond this concern with the negotiations and deal

with the realities of our world, until we deal with the whole agenda of peace, I'm afraid that we will remain hostages to madness and I, for one, and I am sure you, share this with me. I, for one, find it difficult to feel that day after day madness will guarantee me life.

WRHS



Kaddish

Friday

Sunday OCTOBER 27

Those who passed away this week

Yahrzeits

LOUIS L. SQUIRES
 BELLE GURSS
 BENJAMIN A. KAATZ
 SOL H. SCHACHTEL
 BENJAMIN F. KLEIN
 HELEN K. WULIGER
 SAMUEL C. WERTHEIM
 NAN SCHWARTZ SELTZER
 SAM H. GRIFF
 ISAAC E. SPERLING
 JENNIE REITER KLEIN
 MAX FRANKEL
 LILLIAN R. CHERTOFF
 CLARA SCHWARTZ
 PAULA GREENBAUM
 LILLIAN WOLEN
 WALTER PAUL DEUTSCH
 MAX M. ROTHSCHILD
 CHARLES KRAMER
 EUGENE ROSENBAUM
 ROSE RICHMAN UNGER
 ESTHER LEBBY

LEONORE SPERO BASSICHIS
 RACHEL COPELAND
 SAMUEL STERN
 HELENE R. HIMMEL
 SOL DORSEY
 HILDA W. KROHNGOLD
 DR. JACOB SIEBERT
 SADELLE KLEIN
 SAM HARRIS
 HENRY G. SEED
 LILLIAN G. EVANS
 MARY SIMON

TRUE PEACE must be based on more than just ~~reducing~~ ^{reducing}
the means of waging war. IT must address the forces
of tension that provoke man to take up arms.

What if free people could live secure in the knowledge
that their security did not rest on instant U.S. retaliation
to deter Soviet attack, but if we could intercept and
destroy strategic ballistic missiles ~~before~~ ^{before} they reached our
own soil or that of our allies?

ADAMS - 4 days - Bin to disarm the Soviet Union

Marshall Sokolowski - 1950's - A nuclear defense
from nuclear strike

Kruschev - ABM could hit a fly in space

BMD

Labson | Electromagnetic pulse

On the 14th & 20th Nov., just over 3 weeks from now M.L. - the First months of the S.V. & our kindest were made at Lancaster. ^{First} were young desert birds & several ~~the~~ the species from which came the children's letters were being to be ~~the~~ 100's of the world; poor. The second made to be given. The at present called to be typical to the world's unhappy that it could have been used as well as the present important the future of civilized life on earth.

11

[illegible]

But we are now far to the right and valued
~~completing~~ the five + plans & work down to number
222 the production of the super- power network;
 as has added to second to million power -
Eng, Fr, Can, Asia, Pacific, and production - quality
the number second to the super power are to second

angle, orthostele + microphyllous
unusually - used to form canal and US via transmission
 or in conclusion could present as general rules can't

sent to
Paula
on 1/20

sent to
Paula
on 1/20

program would need to be based on the purpose of assured
survival when can assured destruction

What if those people could live secure in the
 knowledge that their security did not rest upon
 the threat of if threat U.S. retaliation then to
 detect a Soviet attack, but if we could intercept
 and destroy strategic ballistic missiles our own
 soil on their own allies?

There was the question of SDI - ^{was it really because} ~~it was not~~ but the hope that they
 the more the hostages ALIVE NOW and the actions of
 Soviet leaders on even the unpredictability if their
 machines

Begin, SDI was frustrated as it was a hard
 new and unproven idea. ANDERSON would have led

demanded SDI as a bill to disband the JOINT UNWIN -
 Presumably, if we were shielded from Soviet attack - if the
 missiles were shot down before they reached our lands - we
 would not need nuclear weapons to Soviet power - we would
 West was equally disturbed. A day is good given the
hostile in the common weapon, advance would be the best
 long cleaner - right is nuclear shield would be the best
 a degree of uncertainty into the unfolding expanding
 might attack in case we cannot if we are not assured
 could stand and they would fight a nuclear war unfolding
 secure last.

especially R.R. SDI was not a new idea at
 all. In the mid 1950's, Russian missile capabilities
 led to the development of missiles and the need for
 a nuclear deterrent from nuclear attack and overhead

in both nations were during weapons for what was called
BMD - Ballistic Missile Defense. By 1962 Kennedy was
in centering plan for to permit phone (used) and in addition
had sound in ABM missile was "hit a fly in space"
and so Soviet Union began to build a series of ABM
launchers, also designed to protect Moscow.

But RSD during the 1960's, was still not at the
size where effective ABM system could be constructed
and in 1972 still - then found it unworkable &
militarily advisable to negotiate a ABM Treaty which
precluded further ABM
deployment and also currently
limited BMD RSD

a great deal more continued to develop to reach
- the end of the 20th century advisable -
- the end of the 20th century advisable -
space. The first figure of the 20th century advisable -
space science purpose - last to be done in the last few years
under the 20th century advisable - the 20th century advisable -
W's & B's of the 20th century advisable - the 20th century advisable -
These are the 20th century advisable - the 20th century advisable -
total to be done in the last few years advisable - the 20th century advisable -
reaches the 20th century advisable - the 20th century advisable -
can be done in the last few years advisable - the 20th century advisable -
which are the 20th century advisable - the 20th century advisable -
was the 20th century advisable - the 20th century advisable -

on ELTON Wagoner pilot
a LASER weapon - placed on an orbiting space
platform used in the last few years advisable - the 20th century advisable -
a new type of launcher - the 20th century advisable - the 20th century advisable -
which are the 20th century advisable - the 20th century advisable -

R.R. SDI had the right to enter if being out in the open top
~~our decision~~ to uncover - what is apparent will
nothing normal now - will probably be - But may have
near ready being ready at the end of the US ABM treaty -
Spec will not be sanctioned -

A very good use for the world - can over time have been
to humanity a benefit - superior always leads to the end -
always always is - arms are being - to be kept that ABM
always can be sanctioned - should be

Best time to be in the world - what is the idea - into
reduction as a goal of peace - on being used to
can sanction sanctioned peace for - that arms control
is not affected

What can be affected - any one may not be affected
possibly not be affected - what is the idea - what is the idea
what is the idea - what is the idea - what is the idea -
what is the idea - what is the idea - what is the idea -

what is the idea - what is the idea -
what is the idea - what is the idea - what is the idea -
what is the idea - what is the idea - what is the idea -
what is the idea - what is the idea - what is the idea -

Date October 27, 1985Service no. 1

UP

GOP

(SOLO)

Opening
anthemPiket: Ma tovu

Bar'chu

Trad.

Sh'ma

Sh'ma

V'ahavta

Braun

Mi chamocha

Ephros

Tzur

yisraeil

Trad.

Avot

DymontC. SMITH

K'dusha

Sulzer

May the

words

JanowskiS. MALKIN~~TORAH SERVICE~~

Anthem/

~~Solo~~Braun: Ahavat olam

Aleinu

Trad.

V'ne-emar

Trad.

Amen

#1 → TO CONG.

Hymn

EIN KEILOHEINU

**

REMARKS

SUN	MON	TUES	WED	THURS	FRI	SAT
13 OCTOBER Religious School 9:30 - 12:00 - Branch <i>EYN</i>	14 Confirmation Class Resumes 4:15 p.m. - Branch <i>KE</i>	15 TWA Activity 10:00 a.m. - Branch Bar/Bat Mitzvah Parents Meeting 7:15 p.m. - Branch TMC Report of Netroli 8:00 p.m. - Branch Temple Religious School Board - 8 p.m. - Branch <i>CO</i>	16 TWA Meeting Fairmount Spanish Dancers 12:30 p.m. - Branch High School 4:15 p.m. - Branch Adult Hebrew 7:00 p.m. - Branch	17	18 Service - 5:30 p.m. The Temple Chapel THIRD SABBATH Dinner and Services 6:30 p.m. - Branch	19 Shabbat Celebration 9:30 a.m. - Branch Bat Mitzvah RACHEL BILLOWITZ 11:00 a.m. The Temple Chapel TYA - Branch TRIVIAL PURSUIT Party - 8:30 p.m.
20 Religious School 9:30 - 12:00 - Branch Religious School Open House - Branch	21 Confirmation Class 4:15 p.m. - Branch	22 Adult Hebrew 7:45 a.m. - Branch TWA Activity 10:00 a.m. - Branch	23 High School 4:15 p.m. - Branch Adult Hebrew 7:00 p.m. - Branch	24	25 Confirmation Class Trip to Cincinnati Service - 5:30 p.m. The Temple Chapel	26 Confirmation Class Trip to Cincinnati Shabbat Celebration 9:30 a.m. - Branch
27 Confirmation Class Trip to Cincinnati SERVICE 10:30 a.m. The Temple Branch Rabbi Daniel Jeremy Silver Will speak on STAR WARS AND OTHER LETHAL GAMES	28 Confirmation Class 4:15 p.m. - Branch	29 Adult Hebrew 7:45 a.m. - Branch TWA Activity 10:00 a.m. - Branch LUNCH WITH THE RABBI Uptown - 12 Noon <i>SUN OR SEP IMN</i>	30 High School 4:15 p.m. - Branch Adult Hebrew 7:00 p.m. - Branch	31 <i>School - Pres In Service 9:30 - 12 MUNSTY</i>	1 NOVEMBER Service - 5:30 p.m. The Temple Chapel FIRST FRIDAY 8:15 p.m. - Branch <i>BACK</i>	2 Hebrew Camp Shabbat Celebration 9:30 a.m. - Branch TMC QUINT TEMPLE AFFAIR 8:00 p.m. Temple Emanuel
3 Hebrew Camp SERVICE 10:30 a.m. The Temple Branch Rabbi Daniel Jeremy Silver will speak on WHO IS A JEW?	4 Confirmation Class 4:15 p.m. - Branch	5 Adult Hebrew 7:45 a.m. - Branch TWA Activity 10:00 a.m. - Branch TYA Board 8:00 p.m. - Branch	6 High School 4:15 p.m. - Branch Adult Hebrew 7:00 p.m. - Branch First Wednesday Discussion Group 8:00 p.m. - Branch	7 SENIORS EVENT 11:00 a.m. - Branch	8	9 Shabbat Celebration 9:30 a.m. - Branch Bar Mitzvah ERIC DOPPELT 4:30 p.m. The Temple Branch Services - 5:30 p.m. The Temple Chapel