

editorial Homemade bombs

The national government's policy of pushing for the construction of nuclear power reactors in place of hydroelectric and other conventional-type power generators has created two problems. The first and, perhaps the most obvious, is the creation of nuclear waste disposal problems. The second, less recognized, is the creation of nuclear by-products that can be used as components in nuclear weapons. The present fission systems being used rely on fast breeder reactors that produce more nuclear fuel than they consume. These reactors also generate plutonium, the key ingredient in atomic weapons.

In addition to the plutonium produced by these reactors in our own country, the US does a booming business in selling these breeder reactors to other countries. Top this situation off with the fact that we also supply nuclear arms to our "friends," and we have a world-wide source of components for nuclear weapons.

The major nuclear powers have at least tried to come to terms and limit the amount of nuclear weapons that could be used in an atomic war. What controls or programs operate to limit the spread of fissionable material? A greater threat than an actual nuclear exchange among the super power is the danger of a terrorist group constructing their own backyard atomic bomb. The technology involved is not that difficult and the components are becoming readily available, especially outside of this country where they likely are to be less stringently controlled.

It is not improbable that within six or seven years, if not some major American city may be held nuclear hostage by a terrorist group. Imagine the advantage of holding a million people hostage instead of a few embassy employees. There would be no defense against such a tactic. It is one thing to stand fast and risk sacrificing a few government employees and quite another to risk the population of an entire city.

One proposal advocated is to ban the export of nuclear material that could be fashioned into a bomb. Critics of this position point out that other nuclear countries export such material and our ban would not solve the problem. The point is that if we refrained from such activities, the amount of nuclear components available would be reduced.

The strictest type of controls are needed to safeguard against the proliferation of nuclear material that can be converted into weapons. We must push for an agreement with other nuclear powers that would restrict both the availability of nuclear weapons components and the number of nuclear weapons devices supplied directly to other countries. The alternative to such cooperation is the likelihood that in the near future any major population center on the planet could be blackmailed with a homemade nuclear bomb.

Letters

Remove right

United Airlines posted a substantial dollar loss for 1975, attributed to the International Association of Machinists' (IAM) 16-day strike in December. Recall for a moment the calamity, the inconvenience we experienced throughout the nation as a result of one labor group's decision to strike and further refusal to negotiate. The adverse repercussions extended to every major city and victimized many within the local community. I am told that this is a nation governed by its people, however, it appears that the people are often governed by something else entirely different. What emerges from my analysis of the situation is another dimension of one of the most controversial issues of this century: anti-trust.

Before this country commits socio-economic suicide, constructive and responsible political advocates should call for removing from any one labor union the right to paralyze the entire country or an entire community as IAM did last year. The anti-trust principle should be extended to include the labor movement accompanied by a bill of rights for management and workers who are caught up in the blight of a labor dispute. Furthermore, laws that prohibit compulsory unionization are desperately needed for the growing number of productive individuals who prefer an open shop.

It is accepted public policy that the government should enforce the country's anti-monopoly

policies, however, it appears that the only game in season is in the same forest frequented by organized labor.

Greg Byler
Architecture junior

Laughter hollow

The modest event (modest by comparison to similar ceremonies at other state universities) held Saturday in the Erb Memorial Ballroom saw expression of two types of power. Each expression was different. The inauguration drew its power from tradition and executive decision. The power expressed through the inaugural event drew another power expression: humiliation. The strategy was confrontation through mimic and shouting.

A quality of confrontation has been that it intensifies and underlines emotions and feelings. I watched as the two power systems met in the opening moments of the modest event. In years past some persons would have demonstrated their support of the confronters as they expressed their views. Others would have expressed their support as established authority took its course. Saturday was different. It was a strange and perverse fun which said to the confronted: "I kill you; I humiliate you; and I obey my impulse without asking myself if it is right." I watched faces during the power expressions. On the platform and in the audience there was a sense of solitude. Pres. Boyd's demeanor was that of a person plunged against his will into reflective solitude. The audience averted its gaze as arrests were made. No cheers, jeers or



applause greeted the acts of established authority. There was only uncertainty which generated solitude and vulnerability which gave way to toleration. The confronters on the other hand enjoyed their own jocularity. It was strange. They played their game as if it were fun—even meaningful—but their laughter was hollow and their multitude of causes were obscured by the game. So it was last Saturday, at the modest event, that the solitude was intensified; the laughter was hollow; and the indictments never made clear. There is an aphorism which may speak in a variety of ways to Saturday's modest event: "Just persons have a thousand truths, and that is their tragedy; the murderer has only one and that is his strength."

Some questions remain: The multitude of issues are not made less important or urgent because of the deep indifference of the confronters. What now of the issues? What will enable us to bridge the abyss and "accomplish the mission of the universities?" By what means will the humane and moral purposes of higher education be advanced? Advanced or retarded by whose use of which power systems?

Douglas K. Huneke
Presbyterian University
Chaplain
Campus Christian Ministry

Coach chills

I was appalled at the actions of an Oregon assistant basketball coach last weekend. Should a coach tell the fans to shut up and in failing to accomplish that call them a derogatory name.

This situation occurred during a time out in the second half of the Oregon State game.

A number of fans were yelling a familiar term—Stuuuuuuu, when one coach stood up and while waving his arms yelled at the crowd to "shut up, shut up, shut up, shut up, you —."

I agree that it is the right of the Oregon coaching staff to determine which players play, but it is also the right of the fans to express their opinions.

There are four games left of Oregon's home schedule and if it weren't for the players, I would tear my student ticket in half. I suffered through 15 hours of freezing and near-freezing weather to get a good seat for a great game, and yet I left the game with a chill throughout my body, just from the irresponsible actions of one coach.

This is supposed to be a class organization. Let's see some of it from the coaches.

Robert L. Mullins
Journalism senior

Never informed

In regard to the defacing of the science library courtyard with the asinine slogan "science for the people, not for profit," I have but a few things to say. I would like to challenge those individuals responsible in a twofold manner: First there may be a time for destructive, violent criticisms of a society, but we are far from that point now. Science, more than any other field, can be effectively manipulated from within the system. I ask you, how did you expect this immature, emotional reaction scrawled on the science library to affect the National Science Foundation's allotment of funds more acutely than if you had simply written your Congressman? I put forth that this act of defacement's sole purpose was to bring attention to the defacer, not to the content of the message.

Second the choice of subjects in this message was poorly chosen and displayed the ignorance of the party responsible. How can science be for profit? Were the advances in genetics which allowed crop production to increase and hungry people to be fed "for profit?" The advances in polymerization chemistry have allowed blind people to see, cripples to walk, heart valves to be repaired and arteries patched; damaged tracheas, larynxes and ureters and someday entire hearts to be replaced. Have these been "for profit?" Through science, we come into contact everyday with material that protects us against heat and cold, electric shock and fire, rust and decay. Are these "for profit?" These vandals were not misinformed, they were never informed.

I grow weary of people who are radical for radicalism's sake. People who crusade for a cause, for the sake of crusading. The persons responsible for this infantile act are so blind to what the real issues are, they don't belong within an institution of higher learning, but in a day care center.

Tad L. Hetu
Biology junior

Put to use

Concerning the recent demonstration at the inauguration of Pres. Boyd:

Few jobs offer less rewards than the job of college president. It seems to be a job where the only feedback is negative. Pres. Boyd was chosen by a committee of students and faculty. His past record was excellent, and the performance he has turned in, in his recent tenure as president has shown a progressiveness and open mindedness that is badly needed at the University.

What the United Front Against Boyd and the rest of the demonstrators fail to realize, is Pres. Boyd's job is not just to cater to a minute micro-minority, but to serve the University community both past and present. Many of the issues included in this recent outburst such as the increase in tuition could not be blamed on the president. In a time of spiraling inflation, the University had to raise tuition to offer the same quality of education that has been presented in the past. It seemed that the demonstration was a useless waste of energy, and if the agitators were really interested in results instead of publicity, they would put their energy to constructive use instead of littering an otherwise pretty campus with their garbage.

Bruce Rosenblum
Accounting junior

Barriers needed

Recently I experienced a needless form of "crowd control" exhibited by the athletic department. I am referring to the Oregon-OSU basketball game Saturday night.

At 5:20 p.m., in anticipation of the doors opening, the line extending down the block (and another forming in the street) proceeded to surge forward, crushing those nearest to the entrance. Subsequent swaying techniques followed in an effort to further condense the line. Once the doors opened this performance was repeated, resulting in a potentially dangerous situation.

A logical solution would be to construct removable steel barriers extending from the doors out to a reasonable distance. This would enable all the doors to be used—without massive ticket-taker attack and prohibit inconsiderate newcomers from trampling those who stood there all day. Channeling the crowd in this manner would prevent serious injury and redirect mob behavior to a more socially acceptable arena—the game itself.

Cathy Tearnen
Psychology