

Opinions expressed on the editorial page are those of the Emerald and do not necessarily represent the opinions of the ASUO or the University. However, the Emerald does present on this page columnists and letter writers whose opinions reflect those of our diverse readership and not those of the Emerald itself.

MIKE FANCHER, Editor

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Ron Eachus
Rick Fitch
Gil Johnson

Linda Meierjurgan
Cliff Sanderlin
John Sasaki

Ron Saylor
Sally Sharrard
Jean Snider

WILBUR BISHOP JR.
Business Manager

RICH JERNSTEDT
Advertising Manager

BARBARA STONE
National Advertising Manager

University of Oregon, Eugene, Monday, January 8, 1968

Big Business Abuse Still a Reality

The Muckrackers and Upton Sinclair's "The Jungle" may be things of the past, but abuses by big business are a reality even today.

The latest example of business placing concern for profit ahead of product quality may well be in the television industry.

There is growing reason to suspect that some color-television sets may be extremely dangerous. Apparently some sets have been found to produce potentially deadly X radiation. The level of radiation may not be sufficient to burn or damage viewers, but according to specialists it may cause genetic damage and premature eye cataracts.

As might well be expected, television manufacturers are publicly saying the whole problem is overrated.

One spokesman for the Electronics Industries Association was recently quoted as saying, "Whether there is even a problem is still in the determining stage. But we think the standards followed during the years have been very stringent and have provided adequate safeguards. We think this is a minor thing overall."

Bunk! In the fall of 1966 the General Electric Co., Schenectady, New York, discovered it had produced some 110,000 color-TV receivers with faulty receivers. Some of those tubes beamed up to 100,000 times more than the agreed upon level of X radiation from the bottom of the sets.

The GE case isn't a completely isolated example. Other tests have shown questionable levels of X radiation from other brands.

The whole issue is still shrouded in much misinformation and lots of studying must be done before TV viewers can rest easy. And fortunately, in the instance of the color-TV sets, most manufacturers seem willing to cooperate in the testing which is being conducted.

But that doesn't answer the question of why such a dangerous mistake was made in the first place and what assurances can be made that other such errors won't endanger consumers in the future.

Robert Leeper U.S. Should Act on Principle It Says China is Violating

Editor's Note: The following column on the United States and Viet Nam was submitted by Robert Leeper, a professor of psychology at the University.

The age group that is paying most heavily for the war in Viet Nam—and that will continue to pay and pay and pay—is obviously the college-age group. Consequently, at the start of this new year, it is important for them to see certain facts clearly and bluntly.

The Administration says it wants to make an honorable peace, but that it cannot because the "enemy" won't negotiate.

The facts are, however, that the means to stop the war, honorably and with infinite gain to the whole world, are entirely within our own power. The war can be stopped now.

Does this mean that we should "surrender to the enemy"? Not at all. Instead, all that we need to do is to start acting on the principle that we say China is violating. We insist that China is unworthy of membership in the United Nations, and especially is unworthy of its intended permanent seat on the Security Council, because China uses force to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries.

Any nation should be treated as an outlaw, we insist, that persistently makes an "attempt to extend power across international frontiers," to quote President Johnson's chief adviser, Walt Rostow.

Let's agree that this principle deserves such heavy emphasis as we have placed on it. But, let us note that it presumably applies to us as well as to other countries.

Let us note that it presumably implies, not merely that each country should refrain from initiating such interference in the internal affairs of any other country, but that, when a country comes to realize that it has violated this principle, it should of course stop its brazen attempt to extend power across international frontiers.

How would all this apply to our war in Viet Nam?

Our active involvement began in 1953 and '54, when President Eisenhower's administration provided the major part of the funds and military supplies to help France continue its fruitless effort, to re-establish colonial rule over Viet Nam, Cambodia, etc.

Yet in his "Mandate For Change," Eisenhower later said, in an oft-misquoted passage on p. 372: "I have never talked or corresponded with a person knowledgeable in Indochinese affairs, who did not agree that had elections been held as of the time of the fighting, possibly 80 per cent of the population would have voted for the Communist Ho Chi Minh as their leader rather than Chief of State Bao Dai" (head of the French-supported regime).

In other words, we used our military resources to try to help establish a regime in the face of a 4 to 1 majority against it.

The situation is not different today. It would be preposterous to say that the American forces would have been fought to a standstill if the Vietnamese people still did not feel, with terrific intensity, that we ought to get out.

If China were caught in such a situation, using our means of war to try to bolster a regime favorable to China's interests in a country where only a small minority were grateful for their presence, what would we say if the Chinese protested, "We would like to make an honorable end to this war, but we can't because the 'enemy' won't negotiate"?

How long would it take us to develop the idea, "You really don't need to negotiate, you know; all that you need to do is this very honorable act: Admit your mistake and get out, maybe taking your cronies with you so they won't be murdered like Diem was"?

If this prescription would be sensible and even mandatory for China, wherein would it be less sensible for us.

Emerald Editor:

To Mr. Spohn

Emerald Editor:

Regarding Mr. Greg Spohn's letter (or should I say, "the letter of Mr. Spohn and Mr. 1st Year Law"? in the Emerald of December 5:

1. Mr. Dennis Phillips is a student, as he himself will surely inform you; Mr. Los Amigos is not: he is a student organization with which Mr. Phillips is affiliated.

2. Neither of them demonstrates more sheep-like qualities than Mr. Spohn. Who but a mutton-head would object to "questioning the things that have made the world the way it is . . ."? Good grief—is he suggesting that we be satisfied with the way things are?

3. As for questioning one's existence: while I am reasonably convinced that I exist, I would respectfully submit that Mr. Spohn is unreal!

4. While it is true that "legalization of marijuana is a

question for the lawmakers of our country," Mr. Spohn seems to forget that someone must bring the question to their attention. Who better than "young student hippies and agitators," along with other concerned citizens who want to see justice done?

5. Finally, Mr. Spohn is correct in defending Miss Daughity's right to express her opinion: could he not bring himself to accord this same right to Mr. Phillips?

Susan Buckles
Sociology, Sophomore

Why Only Hitler?

Emerald Editor:
I have several questions in regards to the articles by Messrs. Fitz and Watson.

Or maybe I should say, why just Hitler? Why not Joseph Stalin, too?

Although Stalin's crimes against humanity are less well known, or perhaps better con-

cealed, than Hitler's, they are probably as extensive, if not more so, especially in terms of the number of people destroyed.

Or are we to overlook the Katyn Forest massacre, the liquidation of the Kulaks, the mass deportation of the Chechen-Ingush to Siberia, and Stalin's execution of fellow Communists? Are we to forget who was Hitler's ally in the partitioning of Poland in 1939?

And should the United States be condemned for aiding Stalin, since he, too, "collaborated" with the Nazis? Rather than comparing President Johnson to Hitler, Mr. Watson, why didn't you write, "Stalin may be alive in the White House today."

Does Marxism give some special sanctity to Stalin, or for that matter, to any Communist crimes against humanity?

Why not be fair and unbiased? Next time you feel the necessity of raising the specter of "monsters," either past or present, do not discriminate against those that carry out their crimes against humanity in the name of Marxism-Leninism. But better yet, why not temper your rantings with just a little objectivity?

Warren W. Tozer
Graduate, History

A Reaction

Emerald Editor:

Well, you have done gone and did it again.

I warned you once how Ignatz reacted to that sort of thing, but you chose to ignore me. Now kindly observe my tripe-spaced, typewritten, ink-signed song of woe.

I was roused from blissful slumber early one a.m. by a wild scream of agony from the front room. It was like the yell of a damned soul. Bits of loose plaster from the ceiling of my palatial sleeping chamber sprinkled my face. I rushed out, in a tangle of blankets.

Ignatz, my roommate, sat before the fireplace with a dead match in one hand and a dead newspaper in the other. Tears trickled untidily down his nose. "Look," he blubbered. "Look, They did it again."

While lighting the fire that morning, he had glanced at the kindling and chanced on the

(Continued on page 11)

An Introduction to the Conrad Cartoon



"The Pope wanted you to have the St. Christopher medal, Luci . . . He gave me this other one!"



"It's got a bad heart, all right . . . but where are we going to find a donor?"