

Overt change

The United States' covert role in Angola ended last week when both the House and Senate voted overwhelmingly to deny the further use of military appropriation funds in Angola. The administration, however, refuses to let the issue die. Denied the use of CIA and military funds for covert operations, Secretary of State Kissinger is pushing for overt support of the pro-Western factions.

Speaking before the Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee on African affairs, Kissinger said, "On the issue of Angola, the administration is now seriously considering overt financial aid and we will soon be consulting with the Congress on this possibility." The Secretary seems to feel that while Americans were opposed to covert intervention, we would support open intervention in Angola.

The administration's assumption that we are willing to play policeman to the world is not reflected in the Congress or by the public reaction to our role in Angola. We have been enmeshed in one military confrontation after another since the end of World War II because Washington has perceived every move by the Russians as a direct threat to our security. Kissinger's view of the world in terms of a giant chess board and a classical balance of power may move the state department but leaves most Americans, especially since Vietnam, unconvinced.

A hands-off policy towards Angola makes even more sense now, especially in light of the latest military development in Angola. The Soviet-backed factor has had some success in capturing conventional military objectives, but is now faced with a guerrilla warfare situation. The Russian and Cuban troops can probably expect as much success in dealing with that type of situation as we had in Vietnam.

Now that our intervention has been curtailed, they are the only foreign powers fighting in a civil war thousands of miles from their homelands. Our position should be to publicize this fact to the world. Other African countries are as disturbed by the Russian presence as we are. We should join with them in protesting this action before the UN and the Organization for African Unity. Freed from our previous involvement, we can now enjoy the political advantages of a non-combatant. We must not let this opportunity slip by or make the mistake of thinking that overt military aid is anymore justifiable than covert military aid.

Letters

Student pitied

Pitied be the poor student who is unable to register for a much-desired class during regular registration and is forced to endure the extreme hassle which inevitably accompanies one's attempts to register for said class during the drop-add period following.

Such has been my case as I have tried to enroll in a crowded Search class, "A History of the Beatles." The victim of a late registration time, I was forced to settle for a respectable number four position on the class waiting list and was told I had a chance to get into the class if I showed up the first day and talked to the instructor.

This I did, and since the class had a surprisingly low turnout for a full class, I was told by the instructor I would be able to enroll. No hassle—all I would have to do was journey over to the music office and tell them he said I could enroll and that would be it.

Nothing doing. Despite my insistence that I had, in fact, been given the okay by the class teacher himself that I could enroll, I was told by a student worker that the music department took a very tough position on enrolling students in the Beatles' class since it was already full and in such high demand.

I would need a note from the teacher if I wanted to enroll. So I strolled dejectedly out of the office while entertaining myself with memories of high school enrollment procedures where my honesty and integrity had also been insulted in cases when I had to obtain notes from teachers to prove I had been given consent to enroll in certain classes.

Down, but not out, I returned to my instructor the next week and told him of my predicament. Slightly angered by the ob-

stacle of the music department, he immediately called upon them and made it quite clear that myself and several other students who were having the same problems, were, in fact, able to enroll in his class.

So a few days afterwards I again made the long trek to the music buildings, confident that my troubles were now behind me, and that I would have no problems now in enrolling. So you can imagine my extreme displeasure when I was told by a student worker that they were now out of registration forms, and if I wanted to register for the class I would first have to go over to the registrar's office and pick up a form.

At this point I could have strangled everyone sitting in that office. But calmer emotions prevailed as I stopped and wondered if the two measly credits I would receive for taking the course were really worth all the hassles it requires to enroll in it. Perhaps one should receive a credit simply for making the attempt.

Obviously something needs to be done to streamline registration procedures during drop-add periods so hassles of this nature, while rare, can be totally eliminated in the future.

John Meine
Pre-journalism
Freshman

Not shared

There is a logic behind the act of "defacing" a wall with (and believing in) the slogan "science for the people, not for profit." The letter to the *Emerald* which called it "radical for radicalism's sake" could not understand that logic. And so the critic laid on us some assumptions that radicals do not share—namely that science is for the people in capitalist society,



'AW, C'MON — YOU KNOW AN ARMY MARCHES ON ITS STOMACH...'

More from Les

By LESLIE ZAITZ

Fadeley in trouble

Editor's note: The following political column by Leslie Zaitz will be appearing on a regular weekly basis. The column will concentrate on political candidates, races and issues, with emphasis on city, county and state contests. Zaitz, a political science major, was last year's associate editor for politics for the Emerald. He currently works as a reporter for the Springfield News.

With the political attention of most people turned towards the scramble for Presidential nominations, two big statewide organizations have been sneaking in the backdoor in the Emerald Empire, preparing an assault on Nancie Fadeley's bailiwick, Dist. 42.

The groups plan to level Mrs. Fadeley not only with money and manpower but by joining hands with local Republicans and a provincial Springfield group.

A bunch of Springfield people of both parties have gotten together and decided they don't like a Eugenean representing them. And Republicans just naturally don't like Democrats.

Mrs. Fadeley has endeared herself to environmentalists with her leadership in passing the bottle bill and field burning bans. Though she technically represents Springfield, she is more often labelled as part of the Eugene Delegation to the Statehouse. She lives east of campus.

That strong Eugene identification and her environmental, anti-business philosophies are shaping as the battle ground for a political war against Mrs. Fadeley.

The major warrior at this point seems to be Oregonians for Free Enterprise (OFFE). OFFE is a "non-partisan" group of 200 businesses and business people around the state, dedicated to advancing free enterprise. This "non-partisan" disclaimer is in reality a shield for Republican business enterprises.

Indeed, its board of directors includes several prominent Republicans, including Eugene's Leonard Wildish. Wildish is chief fundraiser for the Lane County Republican organization.

OFFE has spent six weeks poking around in Springfield, trying to find a Democrat to challenge

Mrs. Fadeley in the May primary. They've approached, it seems, any Democrat who has had his name in the paper twice in one year.

It's been "no go", though. The carrot of manpower and money hasn't been enough to lead any Democrats to the political harness.

Failing there, OFFE went to the other side, checking with local Republicans, who practically advertise their dislike of Mrs. Fadeley.

OFFE was directed to an informal coalition of Springfielders determined to get a Springfielder to represent the city, regardless of party affiliation. OFFE is letting that group recruit a candidate while offering dollars and pamphlet-passers as enticements.

Spurred by OFFE's prodding, that coalition has initially tagged Republican Mayor Vance Freeman as "it." The hope is his strong Springfield identification couples with a big campaign war chest can end what one Republican call "the Fadeley dynasty."

OFFE's interest in replacing Mrs. Fadeley with someone more responsive to business concerns is not unique. A newly-formed group of valley farmers has made noises about helping beat Mrs. Fadeley. FarmPAC (political action committee) expects to put more manpower than money in the race. With grass seed growers counted as members, the money could be there, too.

FarmPAC hasn't formally committed itself to unseating Fadeley but its vice president, Jim Gear of Eugene, said that will be his recommendation when the group meets later this month. He doesn't care who runs against her.

Despite these big guns and Springfield provincialists, Mrs. Fadeley can expect solid support from hardcore Democrats in Springfield, where Democratic registration outstrips Republican by two to one.

There is an evolving spirit in Springfield, however, to shirk the role of "little brother to Eugene." Ejecting Nancie Fadeley would be one way to break the hackles, the thinking in Springfield says.

How big a role OFFE, FarmPAC and other groups still lurking in the background will play is a guess at this point. It's a sure bet, though, that Nancie Fadeley has one helluva fight on her hands.

and implicitly that Congress is for the people in capitalist society. (In the latter radical slogan-writing was thought to be an asinine, childish thing to do when one could surely write to Congress to be heard.)

On the first point, radicals believe that society is characterized by one class of people maximizing profit at the expense of others. Hence, any social services and medical breakthroughs are not given top priority unless they are reasonably profitable. By and large they do not make profit the way that the space, military or highway boondoggles do.

Marxism is a form of radical

materialism which analyzes and describes the historical relationship between technology and profit.

The evolution of science is the history of continually revolutionized profit-making. For example navigation was developed to develop trade, that is, trade which did not benefit most in the mother country, much less in the exploited ones. The fact that, say, "religious" refugees benefited by the invention of ships and navigation is incidental to its intention. Likewise, physics and chemistry developed to increase industrial production and profit.

On the second point Marxism

offers that the state apparatus is functional to profit. This means that Congress is by, for and, in some cases, of the monied class. Most people are apathetic to the voting machine and probably realize the implications of it (that they are essentially powerless in class society such as it is) while most liberals don't.

Radicalism is the rational and natural response to a seemingly irrational system in which the wealth is increasingly going to the powerful rich and supporting their priorities.

Cora Fisher
Sociology, grad.

Tuesday, February 3, 1976