

Same group new name

Locally, Portland General Electric is pushing the Trojan Nuclear Plant up to 75 per cent capacity even though a failure in the electrical wiring circuitry prevented both auxiliary feedwater pumps from operating properly during a test run, Feb. 29. In spite of this malfunction in the plant's safety system, Portland General Electric still plans to go to 75 per cent capacity later this week unless officials of the Oregon Energy Department, investigating the malfunction, step in and dissuade them.

Despite resistance from a large segment of the population, the drive toward increased development and dependence on nuclear power continues.

Nationally, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and the Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA) seem little impressed by the recent resignation of four high-level engineers at General Electric Co. who cite a lack of adequate safety features.

The deaf ear that these bureaucracies turn toward charges of excessive hazards, while hardly commendable, is understandable when one considers where the bulk of these bureaucrats come from. Seven thousand of them were transferred from the old Atomic Energy Commission to the ERDA.

The government's commitment to the development of nuclear power is directly related to our nuclear arms and space race. During the height of the cold war, the Soviet Union launched its Sputnik and beat us into space. In an almost hysterical reaction, the public demanded more emphasis on space-related technologies and nuclear physics. The government introduced the National Student Defense Loan program to encourage more students to go into the physical sciences in order to beat the Russians to the moon.

Only so many of these graduates went to work for the government directly. Most joined private industries involved in federal defense or space projects. Along comes the energy crisis and the emphasis shifts to alternate sources of energy. Given the nuclear orientation of a large number of scientists working in these fields, it is no wonder that nuclear power plants came out on top.

Proponents of nuclear power in this state have yet to satisfactorily prove that such plants can be operated safely. The question of how to dispose of the radioactive waste hasn't been answered yet either. Until these questions can be adequately answered, Oregonians must oppose any further expansion of nuclear power plants in this state.

Letters

Misnomer harmful

The "chairperoffspring" gag cited in "Letters" (*Emerald*, March 5) is extremely funny, but one would hope that journalism and English scholars, at least, would understand the symbiosis of culture, language and personality: that as we use words to express our thoughts, those words use us by guiding our thoughts along their societally-routed grooves. If we're to take responsibility for our attitudes and actions, we must continually re-examine our society and our language.

I will not call a woman a "man"; I will not use a male label like "chairman" for a job performable by women and men. That kind of misnomer is not merely inaccurate, it is harmful; it damages our perception of our society and of ourselves. If "chairperson" sounds inelegant to you (as it does to me), then help us come up with some realistic alternatives. Personally, I don't even find "chair-man" particularly evocative of a director of a meeting. What is it that compels us to retain inaccurate or obsolete usages? When verbal dinosaurs reinforce a power-structure, it is those so favored who resist socio-linguistic change.

Paul Novitski,
independent studies, soph.

Not fooled

I am appalled by the article in the *Oregon Daily Emerald* (February 24) concerning the ASUO plans for a mail-out balloting system for candidate elections. In the past, polls have been located strategically throughout campus, so the only reason for a student not voting was lack of desire or interest. By initiating a mail-out balloting system, the effort to vote is only reduced slightly which will probably not significantly increase voter turnout.

In the bid for an independent student bargaining unit, the ASUO hopes to use the increase in voter turnout to prove to the legislature and State Board of Higher Education that it is indeed responsive to student desires. The contention of the ASUO that an increase in voter turnout is synonymous with an increase in student input into decision making is a fallacy that will not fool these governing bodies. The election of a candidate on the basis of his platform only shows general agreement with that candidate's platform. It is not indicative of student participation in decision making, nor does it take into account issues which arise after a candidate is elected.

I suggest that if the ASUO desires to have more student input into the decision making processes, they should continue and expand the use of mail-out opinion



opinion

Salary adjustments explored

Since there is a feeling that faculty consideration of the method of distributing monies for "across the board" salary adjustments is not appropriate because new salary scales and possible bargaining arrangements are now under active consideration, and that the University Senate and University Assembly should not concern itself with these matters because these bodies have some student members on them, I would like to make a brief statement.

In the first place the fact that these matters are now under active consideration seems to me to be an added reason for expression of faculty opinion, if there is one, about any part of the question that interests them. Any input prior to the freezing into final form of a new arrangement has a better chance of being useful, than does chattering about it after arrangements have been finalized. I should think those charged with the responsibility for deciding upon the details of these arrangements would welcome any such expressions as an aid in their work.

Secondly, as to the presence of students in the Senate and Assembly—I would point out that the number of students on either of these bodies is too small to influence any decisions on which there is a consensus of faculty opinion. On matters about which we have no consensus their participation should also be welcome. They are an important and responsible element in our University community. They are indirectly affected by decisions of this sort too, and participation in making real decisions is highly educational. In any case, the question was moot in the Senate because of the high degree of consensus and because the student members discreetly refrained from voting on this particular question.

I should also point out that my motion only calls for an expression of faculty opinion on which manner of making "across the board" adjustments is preferable. It is not mandatory legislation. To me, the present system seems inversely related to the needs of the faculty and to the good that such adjustments might accomplish in combating inflation or other general changes in the

economy. I think it exacerbates any existing inequities, and makes the University a less desirable place for new people to come to work.

However, if there are special merits in the present system which I do not understand or if the faculty simply prefers it, that's fine too. I have finally gotten up to the point that I am a beneficiary of the present arrangement and I certainly welcome the extra money whenever it is added to my salary, even though I am sorry some of my more needy colleagues are not getting their fair share.

I am appending a statement unanimously adopted by the executive committee of the local chapter of the AAUP which shows their concern with this question.

"The chapter recently surveyed the attitude and opinions of the faculty regarding the preferred method of distributing any forthcoming salary increases. While we have not yet completed a detailed analysis of the returns, we have made a preliminary review of them. As the result of this, and from subsequent discussions, the executive committee moved and unanimously approved the following position statement.

"In view of the rapid increase in the cost of living and with recognition of the serious inequities in the UO faculty salary structure, we propose that after setting aside a portion of the salary improvement money for promotions, the balance should be divided equally among all faculty members. Part time faculty should receive an appropriate proportion of the sum distributed to each full time faculty member.

"In the judgment of the committee, a distribution such as recommended above has the advantage of giving all faculty some cost of living adjustment, and, at the same time, would raise those people at the lower end of the salary scale relative to those at the top.

"We feel that the whole question of salaries and their distribution is one of the crucial issues we face at this time."

Bayard H. McConaughy
professor, biology

polls. Those students with an interest to vote will surely continue to do so at the usual polling locations.

John Palmateer
physics, sr.

John Strandberg
pol. sc., sr.

everyone is welcome and urged to come to this one.

Denise Manion
sr. pol. science

Sauna Hedert
sr. sociology

gave a confident nod to Washington. I do hope that future decisions of the NCAA are better thought out and deserving of that confidence.

Rick Buchanan
pre-journalism, soph.

Better thinking

Concerning the NCAA Basketball Championship Tournament, I believe the NCAA was inexcusably premature when they picked Washington as the second Pac-8 team. There are many important factors involved in making such a decision and before a just decision can be reached, all of those factors should be considered. The NCAA obviously doesn't agree, otherwise they probably would have waited for the final Pac-8 standings. And they would have seen that Harshman's crew is only the fourth best team in the Pac-8. Instead, they seemingly ignored two very good Oregon teams and

Union thanks

We would like to thank Lora and the *Emerald* for giving coverage to the Women's Studies Student Union. We had two successful and pleasant discussions. Minutes of those meetings are available in 17 and 605 PLC. We will be having a final organizational meeting April 5 at 6 p.m. in the EMU for everyone to meet together and make decisions on our organization. If anyone didn't get a chance to come to the first meetings,

Letters policy

The *Emerald* will accept and try to print all letters containing fair comment on ideas and topics of concern or interest to the University community. Because of space limitations, letters must be no more than 250 words, typed, triple-spaced, dated and signed with the person's major. No unsigned letters will be published. Longer opinion columns will be published whenever possible after being submitted to the editorial page editor. The limit on opinion columns is 800 words, using the same format as letters.

Wednesday, March 10, 1976