

Admit Vietnam to U.N.

President Carter's Ambassador-designate to the United Nations, Andrew Young, said Thursday that he hopes Vietnam can be admitted to the U.N. Those are encouraging words.

The United States has almost singlehandedly prevented Vietnamese membership in the U.N. since the country was unified in 1975. Motions to admit Vietnam were vetoed by the U.S. Ambassador on five separate occasions. The nations that favor admitting Vietnam — an overwhelming majority of U.N. members — finally gave up the effort until after the November elections.

The Ford administration's reason for its steadfast opposition to Vietnamese membership was that Hanoi had not accounted for American soldiers missing in action.

The issue of the MIA's is one of the most complex and emotionally charged residuals of the war. Though little hope remains that they will ever return, to abandon all hope would seem a betrayal.

But admitting Vietnam to the U.N. is hardly synonymous with giving up the MIA's for lost. A hostile diplomatic attitude toward Vietnam hasn't led to a full accounting of MIA's; maybe a diplomatic recognition of the fact that the war is over would get some results. And in all fairness, another question must be asked: How many Vietnamese soldiers are missing in action?

Andrew Young and the Carter administration have a splendid opportunity to show the world that they intend to take the spirit of the United Nations in good faith. Allowing Vietnam to send a delegation to New York wouldn't cost the United States a dime and would score goodwill points with most — and maybe all — member nations. It would be a sign that the Carter administration's diplomacy will be created from the new perspective of the seventies, not rooted in the old politics of the sixties.

Letters

Sexist ballad

In a time when women are facing greater restrictions on their right to abortion; when moralizing religious fanatics have tried to control women's bodies and minds in the most repressive way possible; on a globe plagued with sexist oppression of one half its population; I suppose I should not be surprised that such a slick, romantic, (not to mention aesthetically cliché) poem was found in the Emerald's pages.

I refer to Fay Clayton's "Ballad of the Unborn" (Emerald, 1/26/77).

I can only ask why Fay Clayton is so moved by the "fate" of a small, unformed conglomeration of cells which has only the potential of life, and no thought or feeling for the real human beings faced with the lifetime of burden that usually accompanies the tragedy of an unplanned child.

Fay, no woman makes the choice lightly, but it is hers alone to make. Until the world has made a place for the unwanted "born" you should sing your "ballads" for them and their mothers instead.

Jean Vignes
Freshman-Music

No in-between

I suppose as long as we are emotional beings there will be those who confuse the issues on certain arguments due to emotional ties: the recent opinion on abortion by Liz and Pat being the case in point. The attempted flamboyant defense of abortion seems to me to mitigate against their argument more than for it. You see, Pat and Liz, if you really believed that an unborn fetus is not alive or not human you would

have no need of justifying abortion as you try to do. Surely, nobody would argue against a mother's decision to destroy something that is not alive or not human.

On the other hand, if an unborn fetus is alive and is human, nothing, except maybe a mother's endangered life, would justify the abortion any more than anything would justify the killing of a baby already born. By the very fact of trying to justify abortion, you are placing a high value on the unborn life, but yet a higher value on the mother's discomfort or displeasure. An unborn fetus is either fully human or not so at all, and therefore deserves the highest regard as human life or no regard at all; there is no in-between.

I am in sympathy with women who really face the problem and I feel everything that can be done should be done to help those in need. Those responsible on both sides should be made to share as much as possible in the responsibility.

I conclude, however, that no one's misfortune or discomfort can be reason enough for the taking another's life.

P.S. Thank you, Fay Clayton, for your superb poem "Ballad of the Unborn".

Kenneth D. Rubesh
Senior-Computer Science

Gallo propaganda

I was generally disgusted Wednesday morning by the opinion written by Daniel J. Solomon of E. & J. Gallo Winery. While I do not have the best access to the facts, I am aware of a few of them.

Whether or not the United Farm Workers spent one million dollars on Proposition 14, remember why

Proposition 14 was necessary. It was necessary because the lettuce growers and Gallo lobbied the California legislature to not pass funds for the Agricultural Labor Relations Board. So now that board is operating under limited funds.

The dispute at Gallo is also more than "a union jurisdictional dispute with Gallo caught in the middle." I wonder if Mr. Solomon's memory is so bad that he has forgotten the sweetheart contract that Gallo signed with the Teamsters Union. Perhaps he agreed to forget about it during his last martini lunch with the local Teamster boss.

Mr. Solomon's facts sound very good, but some people will make anything sound good if the money's right. I'm sure Mr. Solomon makes more than the \$3.26 starting salary for farm workers while he does his job of writing Gallo's propaganda.

I would like to congratulate Jan Oliver, Jamie Burns and the rest of the ASUO on the position that they took supporting the UFW and for their decision to place disclaimers by E. & J. Gallo's advertising.

Jack Condliffe
President
UO Student Employee's Union
AFSCME Local 1893

The zygote blues

I have a friend, a theologian and otherwise disreputable fellow, who's given to saying: "People are dumber than they are given credit for."

I suspect that Elizabeth Bardossi and Patricia Holmes have risen to the level of their psychic incompetence, as do most crusader rabbits, so I'm yoddlng to the underachievers — the pink hordes — out there.

From Vietnam it was learned that it's untidy when little unpleasanties are not snuffed out with dispatch. Certain women and their mates have learned this lesson well, and applied it to their bodies. So it is that most rights are not given, they are taken, and probably at another's expense.

We being an orderly people, it is downright unsettling to observe instances where order and disorder energize one another. But wait, in this age of telecommunica-

tions and micro-understanding, one can, with a little luck, find somewhere a defense for any belief, some hip pigeonhole in which to snuggle with one's cretinized whims.

No question about it. Pollutants can ruin the rarefied air. Especially when one's been to see the elephant. Fact is, even that grey behemoth is bitching about some uncomely varicose veins.

No kidding. This old zygote's got the blues.

James Dietz
Graduate-Librarianship

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.

opinion

Creationism unscientific

I would like to thank the Creation Study Forum for putting on the recent presentation concerning the opposing theories of Creation and Evolution. However, my belief in evolution was not seriously shaken. As a biology graduate student, I have obviously been indoctrinated in the evolutionary way of thinking, but my direct areas of interest — genetics, biochemistry and development — are not very related to questions of how life originated.

I think that the creationists have missed the point in trying to be scientific. Most scientists don't reject creationism because the evidence for evolution is so overwhelming. There are indeed gaps and unexplained happenings in the fossil record, which evolutionists tend to explain away by waving their hands. The real problem is that the theory of creationism is inherently unscientific.

Science is a materialistic philosophy, and I don't apologize for that unqualified statement. Evolutionism is a scientific theory because it tries to explain things using solely natural forces and events. Creationism is not a scientific theory because it postulates the existence of a supernatural force, a God, who made things the way they are for reasons ultimately unknowable to us. Scientists believe that everything in the realm of science can be known and explained naturally, and to accept the theory of creation would be to reject this most basic of principles. The structure of scientific knowledge would be shaken from end to end, and every fact would be called into question — the effect would be far greater than the effect Einstein's theories had on physics.

Such a revolution could conceivably occur, but the evidence for such supernatural events would have to be incredibly compelling — the evolutionists would have to lie on the floor whimpering whenever the subject was brought up. As things stand today, two evolutionists, Dr. Boucot and Dr. Simonds, were quite willing to debate, and although I couldn't understand all of the evidence, it was obvious that Dr. Gish, the creationist, was not overwhelming them. At most it might be said that the current evidence is slightly tilted in favor of creation, and that is not nearly enough for me to completely overthrow my basic scientific philosophy in favor of a belief in supernatural forces.

In closing I want to point out that explaining everything in the world scientifically is not my ultimate goal. God and Jesus Christ may very well exist, and they may well influence people's lives; however, they have no place in science.

Rick Johns
Graduate, Biology

Duck Soup

Oregon Daily Emerald



"Not bad for doodling in your spare time."