

# Oppose nukes, support Emily

Submitted by Vip Short  
476 W. 23rd Ave., Eugene

Because much of the information put out in the controversy over nuclear power has focused on the obvious, visible, and sensational dangers which it presents, there has been a tendency to regard those people concerned about nuclear power as paranoid antitechnologists. Utilities have accused them of playing improbable "what-if" games and using scare tactics. I'm writing this to stimulate an awareness of nuclear fission's not-so-obvious dangers. These include the genetic and carcinogenic impacts of continuing, low-level radiation leakage and "disposal" from operating plants, storage sites, and transport events. This is all happening right now; any monitoring program will show it.

The main difficulty with low-level (or any level) ionizing radiation — one which the nuclear industry takes full advantage of in its "clean and safe" propaganda — is that it isn't obvious to the senses. You can't see it, hear it, feel it, or taste it, and it most likely won't "show" organically until long after it has already done its damage. The recent hoopla over the unidentified radio-frequency signal here causes me to wonder, again, just what the media criteria are for reporting invisible health hazards. The local papers had a field day with this issue, and with swine flu and the recent hepatitis non-epidemic. Certainly microwave radiation of the intensities reported should be cause for concern, as recently emphasized in Broder's book "The Zapping of America." However, recent testimony concerning the Trojan plant's contamination of Oregon, Eugene included, with Strontium-90 levels exceeding maximum permissible doses on several documented occasions was all but passed over by the various media. This stuff acts like calcium and gets right into the bones. Evidence is mounting that leukemias and bone cancer can be attributed to Sr-90's activity. These cancer rates are rising incredibly fast (3 percent rise from 1975 to 1976, according to Dr.

Helen Caldicott) and we can expect the rise to continue accelerating; infants, children and the unborn are most susceptible; Sr-90 is rained on vegetation which is consumed by dairy cows who then pass it on to us in very high concentration — here we are at the top of the food chain — in their milk. Trojan and other nuclear facilities are right now condemning increasing percentages of entire generations to death and disease. But don't worry, it won't show up for a while. We are in the midst of an invisible epidemic.

Milk samplings are done following atmospheric nuclear tests. Operators of Trojan, in their operations manual, put the blame for the increased Sr-90 levels on the Chinese bomb tests. Dr. Ernest Sternglass showed in the December 1976 trial of the "Trojan 96" that at least one instance of sharp rise in Sr-90 levels could not possibly be attributed to the bomb fallout: it was "tagged" by Cobalt-58, which is never a product of nuclear bombs, but rather a radioactive by-product of nickel and other elements used in nuclear power reactor innards.

In addition, the intensity of the Sr-90 contamination found throughout the Pacific Northwest in this particular sampling fans out from Columbia Co., with Trojan the veritable epicenter of contamination. Yet the operators of the plant decided to ascribe this radioactivity to a Chinese fallout cloud so that Trojan wouldn't be shut down for exceeding standards and endangering the public! As Dr. Sternglass wryly stated during his testimony, "It is highly unlikely that the radioactive cloud would come over from China and condense right over the cooling tower of Trojan. I am forced to conclude . . ."

So Trojan, and undoubtedly many other nuclear facilities, have been known to exceed the established federal standards for safety to populations both in their planned and "unplanned" releases. Add to this the increasingly-acknowledged and horrifying fact that these standards were set before anybody even had a chance to figure the actual long-term effects of low-level radiation. Sternglass and many, many other

reputable scientists who have been studying this for decades now believe that the possibility of severe deleterious effects from low-level radiation has been underestimated by a factor of 100 to 1,000 times! "Existing standards are at least one hundred times too high," states Sternglass. He calls the current production of low-level radiation a "biological hazard to the fate of this nation." Dr. John Gofman was commissioned by federal agencies in the late 1960s to assess the standards of permissible dose in effect. He came up with the same conclusions as Sternglass has, but he and his colleague Arthur Tamplin — both highly distinguished scientists — met the fate of the bearer of bad news. Gofman was forced to leave his job with the AEC.

I could go on and on, but the implications of what has been said so far should be enough to blow any sensible, thinking person away. I'll skip over the studies of infant mortality rates done in the vicinities of nuclear plants; I won't mention the specifics of the cancer studies done by Bertall, Mancuso, and others.

It seems easier to shut off radio signals, (The F.C.C. has more clout than the N.R.C., I guess.) Transmitters are shut down all the time. And once down, there's no more hazard: the signal disappears into galactic space. Unfortunately that's not the case with nuclear power plants. When Trojan is shut down, be it in one year or at the end of its operating life 30 years from now, we'll still be left with a nice little worrisome plutonium package (produced by Trojan at the rate of 600 lbs. a year) — good for at least 250,000 years of possible genetic and organic damage to all things living.

Meanwhile, Trojan keeps right on chugging, assuming we stay lucky for a while longer and the refueling occurs without serious mishap. If this concerns you, please consider registering Democrat for the primaries (if that disturbs your hip image of cool anarchy or whatever, you can always un-register afterwards or switch back to defiant independent), help elect Emily Ashworth governor of this state, and de-commission Trojan.

# Future security lies in U.N. hands

Submitted by John Steinbreder  
Senior, Journalism

Recently the United Nations has been called on increasingly to intervene, as a neutral force, in some of the world's most explosive regions. In a move expedited by the United States and aided by Chinese and Russian abstentions, the U.N. voted to send a peacekeeping force to southern Lebanon. Currently they are patrolling the Israel-Lebanon border, acting as a buffer between the Palestinian and Israeli forces. In a speech during a state dinner in Lagos, Nigeria, President Carter called for U.S. - United Kingdom sponsored talks on Rhodesia that would include all involved factions and representatives of the U.N. The President seems to be applying greater emphasis on U.N. participation in all facets of international relations.

Paradoxically, the nation that used the good services of the U.N. during the early fifties to carry out its own foreign policy in Korea is utilizing the organization today as a truly neutral mediator. This emphasis on U.N. participation demonstrates both the growing importance of its role in shaping world affairs and the need to solve international conflicts and problems through international bodies.

Deployment of U.N. forces is, in a sense, a collective call by nations for easing of conflicts. U.N. intervention buys the valuable time for political negotiations and allows a calm to settle over the storm. Worldwide pressure and concern tend to eliminate the political implications and misgivings that arise under individual nation pressure, thereby allowing intervention without instigating bloc conflicts. Such an international force, labeled as "neutral," stands ominously between the forces at odds. Its mere presence demonstrates that the conflict is one of international, rather than solely regional, concern and has attracted the attention of a variety of ideologies, blocs and ethnic groups. It is inevitably more difficult and consequential to strike against such an international force.

This neutral position, enhanced by international backing, has enabled the U.N. forces to operate successfully. In the case of southern Lebanon, the U.N. has the respect of both the Israelis and the Palestinians — the Israelis owe their very existence to the United Nations, and the PLO procured important U.N. recognition and support, which strengthened its worldwide position. Any attack on the U.N. forces by either side would lead to international denunciation and a severe loss of support within the organization, something neither side can afford. Quite successfully, then, the U.N. stands between the Israelis and the Palestinians, keeping them a reasonable distance apart.

Granted, the U.N. intervention provides merely a short term pain killer to the problem. The cure, obviously, can only be found within the parties that are directly involved; only they can rectify their mistakes and solve their conflicts. Rather than superpower intervention or manipulation, U.N. intervention provides for participation by many nations in handling world affairs. The collective interest is in peace and the consequences of a workable, collective force are obviously beneficial. It's a sign that the bi-polar structure of international relations, centered on the concept of an East-West bloc struggle, has been replaced by one of multipolarity, in which many nations are involved in shaping global policy. The controls of world affairs, once concentrated solely in the hands of the two superpowers, are becoming more evenly distributed. As the nations walk a political and ideological tight-rope, and as the threat of nuclear holocaust looms larger, security and stability of the world lie more and more in the collective co-operation of the U.N. and the nations of the world.

