

Nuclear Testing: The Health Angle

Opponents of continued nuclear weapons testing by the United States cite a number of reasons why we should stop them immediately. Among them is an argument that radioactive fallout is extremely dangerous. This point has been widely debated, not only by politicians and diplomats, but by scientists themselves. The question is not whether there is danger, but to what degree does this danger exist?

Scientists' estimates of this danger range from physicist Edward U. Condon's prediction that "many thousands of persons in the world will suffer agonizing death from bone cancer and leukemia" because of radioactive fallout, to Atomic Energy Commissioner Willard Libby's statement that "hazards of fallout are limited."

It has been estimated that only roughly two per cent of the radiation the average human being absorbs at present comes from nuclear fallout. Most of it comes from cosmic rays emitted by the sun and from medical x-rays. The most harmful element in radioactive fallout is strontium 90, which is chemically similar to calcium and, when

it is deposited in the bones in an amount beyond a certain level, the radiation could cause anemia or death.

Edward Teller, the "father of the H-bomb" who has supported continued nuclear testing, and others say the increased amount of strontium 90 from tests would not be dangerous. They say that the additional strontium 90 is not so great as the difference between cosmic radiation at sea level and places of high altitude.

Teller believes it probable that the root of the opposition to further tests is not connected with fallout, in explaining "anti-test" beliefs by many of his fellow scientists. Their real reason, Teller says, is the desire for disarmament and peace.

This may well be true. But radioactive fallout cannot be disregarded, however. Estimations of increased radiation, remember, are based on present testing—not all-out war. We are reminded of a statement by a campus chemistry professor when questioned on levels of radioactivity from fallout in the event of all-out hydrogen warfare: "Then we've had it."

(Friday: The Military Angle.)

Emerald Policy

A restatement of The Emerald's editorial policy is in order. The Emerald, in its news columns, attempts to give as wide and as fair a coverage of events as possible. Emerald editorials, however, represent the views of the seven-man editorial board, the members of which are listed in the masthead.

The editorial board, meeting in conference, formulates the opinions which appear in Emerald editorials. We seek to present sound opinions and criticisms, based on our investigation and understanding of issues, to interpret issues and problems and, occa-

sionally, to entertain. There is no faculty or administration connection to The Emerald's news or editorial policies.

Those who disagree with The Emerald's views, or seek to present their own views on other subjects, have access to the letters column.

If we were to accept Mr. Cole's definition of an editorial (see letters column)—that is, "to present the prevailing attitude on this campus"—we would simply run a public opinion poll on "prevailing issues." But this would ignore an editorial's most important function: to provide part of the criticism necessary in any free society.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Emerald Editor:

To Mr. Gordon Chong's remarks which appeared in the letters section yesterday I can only say a hearty "bravo." That kind of peace which is based entirely upon a country's ability to wage war is certainly not a worthwhile end for which to strive.

Two letters by a Robert Davis have been printed in which a very practical, very realistic, very short-sighted, very unimaginative stand was expressed. "The men of action," as Mr. Davis refers to himself, and he would include the ROTC, must do their patriotic duty and join the military effort in order to protect their country from the "Russian Menace." To a certain extent the "men of action" are right. Right now it is important to maintain a strong military.

The danger lies in losing sight of our reasons for protecting our culture. We do not want military strength for its own sake nor should we value it only as an instrument to maintain an uneasy peace. On the contrary, we should desire to protect our rights to think and question, those rights which we

are told Russian culture does not grant. It is the exercising of these very rights against which Mr. Davis seems to be objecting. He would give up his right to question. He would leave all decisions to others, trusting that they are experts. Lord help him if they are not.

Mr. Davis contends that he is doing his patriotic duty by supporting whatever military program is decided for him. These programs deserve support. But he censures those intellectual "eggheads" (this kind of cheap name-calling makes me further suspect the shallowness of his argument) who would dare question such programs. Why is Mr. Davis interested in protecting this culture when in practice he is advocating the Soviet system?

Certainly apathy is dangerous to the perpetuation of our culture, but as Mr. Chong says, it is those who seek something beyond what exists, something beyond a peace based on the threat of war, who are most likely to preserve the most valuable aspect of our culture. As for Mr. Davis, I can only advise that every bit as dangerous as an apathetic person, and

more pitiful, is one who does not know what he is fighting for.

Michael Leslie Gong
Junior in Architecture
and Allied Arts

Emerald Editor:

Since all good eggheads must document their statements, I have carefully reread Joseph Alsop's article and my own remark based on it. Since the statement based on it was completely accurate as far as facts go I reserve the right as an American citizen to interpret for myself the implications, I shall not apologize. However I can see that it might be interpreted as Mr. Davis suggests.

For correction also, the petition circulated by Dr. Pauling containing the words, "As scientists we have knowledge of the dangers involved (in nuclear weapons testing) and therefore a special responsibility to make these dangers known," was signed by 9,235 scientists including 36 Nobel Prize winners instead of the 2,000 mentioned. It is interesting to note in Tuesday's Emerald that Dr. Pauling is bringing legal suit against Russia, the U.S., and England in an attempt to stop testing.

The citizen's role is not the blind acceptance of a "party line," military or otherwise, but thoughtful seeking to understand and to speak out on points of concern. I reiterate—the bombing of Sakiel-Sidi-Youssef is a disturbing foreshadowing of what can happen when an army is allowed to think for

(Continued on page 3)

Rewards of Teaching



"WELL, LIKE YOU SAID WHEN YA FLUNKED ME OUT OF SCHOOL: 'WE CAN'T ALL BE BORN WITH A HIGH I.Q.'—I'M JU'S LUCKY I GUESS."

James Marlow

Dulles Is Finally Learning To Quickly Reply to Russia

WASHINGTON (AP)—It's taken the Eisenhower Administration four months, eight letters and three notes to wake up to the idea it might be smarter to answer the Soviets a little faster.

The Soviets have been giving the administration a propaganda clubbing and Tuesday Secretary of State Dulles said the administration was trying to "speed up its operations" so the Soviets will not have the play all to themselves so long.

Last fall the Soviets scored an overwhelming propaganda victory by launching their Sputniks. It took this country months to get its own satellites aloft.

Last December the Soviets started making more propaganda for themselves. On Dec. 10 Premier Bulganin, in a letter to President Eisenhower, represented the Soviet Union as a big peace-lover that wanted negotiations and a summit talk to straighten things out.

It took Eisenhower more than a month to answer. In that time the Soviet Union stood before the world as the one proposing peaceful negotiations while this country tried to think up an answer.

Eisenhower finally wrote Bulganin Jan. 12. But by that time Bulganin had sent him another letter. This was Jan. 8. On Jan. 20 Eisenhower answered Bulganin's second letter with a 40-word note.

Bulganin sent another letter Feb. 1. It took Eisenhower 14 days to answer that one.

On Feb. 28 the Soviets sent a note—not a letter from Bulganin—on a summit get-together. The United States answered this March 6. But the next day, March 7, Bulganin sent Eisenhower another letter. And on March 24 the Soviets answered the American note with a second note of their own.

Meanwhile Bulganin was fading from the picture. Nikita Khrushchev became premier.

Very quickly the Soviets made another propaganda score.

With the whole world worried about nuclear tests, the Soviets announced they would stop their nuclear tests. This time the State Department was ready and fired off an answer immediately.

Then on Friday Khrushchev sent Eisenhower a note on stopping nuclear tests. Eisenhower answered him Monday. Dulles—when he appeared before his news conference yesterday—seemed proud Eisenhower had answered so fast: within four days, which included the Easter holidays.

Dulles has publicly acknowledged the Soviets have been knocking our propaganda pants off. Even Eisenhower at his news conference last week admitted maybe we could have handled ourselves better.

He tossed out the idea of putting a psychological war expert into the State Department. But Dulles is boss there. He runs it pretty much as a one-man show. And at his news conference yesterday he brushed aside the Eisenhower idea.

He said this country can't indulge in the kind of propaganda the Soviets use, and went on to explain the State Department's attitude now on the Soviet notes.

He said: "I think on the whole that it is important to deal with these things quickly. I think that what we did over the Easter weekend is a demonstration that at least in one respect we are trying to speed up our operations so as not to give the Soviet propaganda line a free run for so long a time as has often been the case in the past ..."

"I do believe that as a result of experience that we are improving our techniques somewhat...in terms of trying to get our viewpoint more quickly and more effectively."

One question comes to mind: Why has it taken the State Department so long—and how much experience does it need—to realize it's not smart to let the Soviets make propaganda while we hem and haw on what to do?

Oregon Daily Emerald

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published four times in September and five days a week during the school year, except during examination and vacation periods, by the Student Publications Board of the University of Oregon. Entered as second class matter at the post office, Eugene, Oregon. Subscription rates: \$5 per year, \$2 per term. Opinions expressed on the editorial page are those of The Emerald and do not pretend to represent the opinion of the ASUO or the University.

ALLEN JOHNSON, Editor
WILLIAM COOK, Editorial Page Editor
BILL BRYANT, Advertising Manager
PHIL HAGER, JACK WILSON, Associate Editors
PEPPER ALLEN, News Editor
BOB MULLIN, Sports Editor

GARY CAPPS, Business Manager
JERRY RAMSEY, Managing Editor
Editorial Board: Allen Johnson, William Cook, Phil Hager, Pepper Allen, Bob Mullin, Jerry Ramsey, Jack Wilson.