

editorial

Road dead-ends

Federal bureaucracies concerned with promoting with nuclear energy systems constantly turn a deaf ear to objections against the spread of nuclear power plants. These objections are usually dismissed as meddling academic types or habitual crusaders. These agencies listen more closely to the nuclear power industry than to those who protest that safeguards against nuclear accidents are inadequate.

Now, however, key people within the industry itself are starting to have doubts about the safety of nuclear power plants. Last week four high-level engineers, each deciding independently, resigned from General Electric Co., citing concern with the adequacy of plant design, the threat of human error along the complex chain of the nuclear fuel cycle and the certainty that nuclear regulation is ineffective. One of them said in his letter of resignation, "Nuclear power has become a 'technological monster' and it is not clear who, if anyone, is in control."

In addition to the resignations, Vermont's only nuclear power plant was ordered shut down on Jan. 26 after tests indicated that the reactor safety system might not stand the strain of an accident. Prof. Henry Kendall, a nuclear physicist at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology said that an accident could cause almost immediate death for most of the 55,000 people who live within a 20-mile radius of the Vermont plant.

These developments should cause serious concern at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), the agency responsible for regulating the industry, but it is doubtful they will. When the NRC issues assurances to the public that nuclear power is safe, where does it get its information? It turns to the industry itself. Power companies are committed to expanding nuclear systems because they have invested heavily in them. Companies such as General Electric, which profit from the design and construction of these systems, are the ones that offer the guarantees.

If the industry is so sure of the safety of its plants, why has it found it necessary that the federal government limit the amount of liability for which the industry would be responsible in case of a nuclear accident. The Price-Anderson Act limits liability for an accident at a single installation to \$560 million. The industry and private insurance sources carry only \$125 million of that liability. The federal government underwrites the remaining \$435 million.

Besides the potential danger from a nuclear accident, our rush to convert to nuclear power creates another problem. What do we do when a plant shuts down or malfunctions? The answer in Vermont is that alternative power sources are placed under additional strains. Because of the shut-down in Vermont, New England utilities spend \$250,000 a day for replacement electricity from more expensive sources.

We, in Oregon, face a similar situation. Despite the efforts of many Oregonians, the Trojan nuclear power plant already operates at 50 per cent capacity. We should resist being drawn any further into a nuclear trap. At the very least, we should demand independently-produced evidence that adequate safeguards are feasible. The slightest hint that such guarantees are not possible should be grounds to insist that we no longer travel down this dead-end road.

Letters

Not dead yet

While we are sipping our beer at all-night parties or eating our vegetables and sunflower seeds or listening to a string quartet or worrying over our mid-term grades, Nixon, Mitchell and Kleindienst are trying to take our Constitutional rights away from us.

Surprised? Thought they were "out of the picture?" Well, they are the primary source of Senate Bill 1 and it is not dead yet. This child of the Nixon era has such abilities as to: re-enact the "Smith Act" (Remember the McCarthy "witch-hunts" trials of the '40s and '50s?); insure federal officials (like Tricky Dick, author of the bill) freedom from criminal penalties for an illegal act so long as they "believed" it (the criminal act) was "required or authorized by law." This particular clause is lovingly referred to as the "Nuremberg clause" and it makes legal anything a federal official (or his employees) want to do as long as they "think" they're acting in "national interest" (such as murder? or stealing psychiatric files?).

The bill also minimizes or destroys out-right many of our First Amendment rights of freedom of speech, assembly or press. An estimated 2,600 amendments are

needed to conform the bill (which is over 700 pages long) to our Bill of Rights.

What can you do to stop this debauchery? You can tell your friends about it. You can write Hatfield and Packwood in Washington and tell them to scrap the bill. You can forget about it—but remember it will be illegal to protest against it if it becomes law. This Nixonism is alive and well in Washington and it's our responsibility to "get" it before it "gets" us.

Jean Vignes
Undeclared, soph.

Jailing virtuous

After reading the article "India Consul: Nation Has Discipline Now" in Monday's *Emerald*, I feel that a few comments are needed.

In his discussion of current affairs in India, the Consul General somehow neglected to mention the wonders and delights of a totally censored press, though he did manage to extol the virtues of throwing anyone who disagrees with the Indian government in jail. As he implied in his discussion, it is certainly the right of a "majority government" to censor the expression of opposition to its policies, and to jail opposition.



I happen to personally know several persons who are now political prisoners in India. They are members of Ananda Marga, a "banned" spiritual and social service organization which apparently has disrupted the "smooth functioning" of Indira Gandhi's government by pointing out that the government is run on a corrupt system of bribes. For their moral integrity, the yoga monks and nuns of Ananda Marga are now in jail undergoing inhumane tortures. The Russian KGB (secret police) has helped "modernize" Indian torture methods and Indian jailers have enthusiastically taken to administering electric shocks to the genitals of their prisoners.

So if India has "discipline" now, Indira Gandhi can proudly claim to be following the "disciplined" path of Hitler, Stalin and the rest of history's dictators.

Wayland Secrest
Psychology, grad.

Equal weight

ASUO Pres. Bernau recently criticized severely the procedures for promotion and tenure cases at the UO (*Emerald*, January 30, 1976). He charged that the Faculty Personnel Committee gives research an 80 per cent weight and teaching only 20 per cent. He is wrong. The present committee weighs the two activities equally. It is true that faculty members cannot be given tenure unless they show development as productive scholars, active professionals, or creative artists. It is also true, however, that evidence of good teaching is also required. The University Personnel Committee spends a good deal of time going over evidence of teaching, and it presses departments and colleges to provide it with sufficient data assuring good teaching ability. It frequently makes its own investigations. Bad teaching disqualifies a person for promotion and tenure, as does poor scholarship; and outstanding teaching often compensates for modest scholarship. There are many examples of professors on this campus who have earned tenure and promotion mainly on the basis of their teaching. It is also true, however, that average to good teaching does not compensate for poor scholarship.

Mr. Bernau implied also that a sort of "old boy" system is at work and that promotion and tenure depend on being well-liked within a department. Favoritism may occasionally be present in some departments, but when promotion files come to the Faculty Personnel Committee, which is elected by the whole University faculty and draws its membership from

many departments, the friendship factor carries virtually no weight. Moreover, to protect the unpopular faculty member within a department, the Personnel Committee has the power, and uses it from time to time, to initiate a review for promotion and tenure. Also, a faculty member can initiate a review himself, without waiting for his department to do it.

If Mr. Bernau, who claims knowledge about promotion and tenure review process on this campus, has actually made a study of the system, the Faculty Personnel Committee is unaware of it. To our knowledge, he has not tried to contact the Committee. We would encourage him here, and in other matters of University policy, to gather information more accurately and to deal directly with the responsible committees in order to produce greater cooperation, rather than division, between students and faculty.

Arnulf Zweig for the
Faculty Personnel Committee

Dismal find

Having recently returned to Eugene after an interval of 25 years, (and to Oregon after 22 years) I am somewhat dismayed by what I find, particularly at the University.

Not having been on campus since 1922-23 (as a student), I marvel at some of the changes in emphasis and direction which obtain here in the year 1976.

Bill Boyd, with all the good intentions in the world, seems to think that he can raise funds by appealing to the business and conservative community of this area. I seem to sense that he favors an intellectual and cultured approach to a community dedicated to an excellence in higher education.

But, he is working on the wrong crowd. The average individual, who is an alumnus and "has made it" in this crass plutocratic society, is (for the most part) a materialistic boob, a muscle-brained fan of the rah rah school of organized college sports, an anti-"egghead" type who supports the narrow snob and condescending fraternity crowd. In short, this is vulgarity and vulgarity at its worst in American society. We should, on the contrary, be encouraging just the opposite.

Even though some of the faculty are mediocrities and odd type, crude and spiritually erratic and abrupt (and insensitive) in their relations to their students and associates, yet many are both erudite and intellectually aristocratic personalities. We should support and encourage such excellence, integrity and humanistic attitudes and practices among our educa-

tional leaders at this University.

There are enough boobs and spiritual imbeciles surrounding us, that we should be wary of reducing (lowering) ourselves to their level. American society as a whole is moronic and bad enough without us catering to this John Birchite, Ronald Reagan and very anti-social cabal and lowering our standards to this common and very physical (but well-headed) rabble.

Jim Lincoln
Tuscarora-Cherokee

Save time

Perhaps the *Emerald* could save time by just setting up a standing headline: "Boyd says no." You could use it with:

Minorities; Boyd says no to minority culture centers.

Women; Boyd says no to justice in Anne Frentz case.

Students; Boyd says no to student access to evaluations of faculty; and Boyd says no to student control of Mac Court and Boyd says no to return of misspent dorm monies.

Farmworkers; Boyd says no to UFW lettuce.

Only occasionally would you have to move it from the front page for such press-stoppers as Boyd says yes to more money for football recruiting.

Roberta M. Taussig
research assistant
Clinical Services

Absurd decision

The recent faculty decision to phase out WR 323 as a junior requirement is taking a critical step toward lowering the general academic level of the University.

In light of current declines in SAT English scores and published concern over poor writing habits in higher education, it appears especially ironic that the faculty of the state's "liberal" institution should advocate the removal of WR 323. I applaud Ass't Prof. Aly's opposition to the change, as it seems obvious that juniors, usually deep within their respective majors, much need a bolstering of their writing skills, so important in a liberal education.

If students lack adequate instruction in the class, surely it is the instructor's fault and not the subject's. When a junior in college doesn't "know how to tell a subject from a verb," doing away with the means through which they can learn that difference is both absurd and self-defeating.

Stephen Browne
Pre-journalism, freshman
Wednesday, February 11, 1976