

Election endorsements use panel approach

On Tuesday, the Emerald will begin a series of editorials endorsing candidates and measures in state and local races that appear on the general-election ballot Nov. 7.

These endorsements will complement a continuing Emerald coverage of personalities and issues, culminating with an election supplement in our Nov. 3 issue.

Almost all candidates for political offices at stake in the election have met and discussed campaign issues with a panel of Emerald editors and political reporters.

In these discussions - and subsequent decisions on endorsements - the panel's inquiries focused on the elements and alternatives of growth - the economic and population changes facing Lane County and Oregon.

Specifically, we explored the candidate's knowledgeability, past performance and present positions regarding energy, particularly their attitudes toward conservation, nuclear technology and alternative power sources.

Another growth-related area of ques-

tioning dealt with land-use planning and the environment, including discussion of urban-growth boundaries, preservation of agricultural, recreational and wilderness areas and state involvement in implementing land-use policies.

The issues of taxes and corresponding government services were raised in relation to priorities placed by candidates on higher education and property-tax-relief proposals.

We considered our endorsements in the light of collective values that, we

hope, reveal a humanistic concern for egalitarian justice and practicality, as well as more particular student interests.

To this end, the candidates' styles and emphasis on issues were closely examined for clues as to their sensitivity of the human impact of political decisions.

This attitude also guided our scrutiny of such ballot propositions as reinstatement of the death penalty and prohibitions on state abortion aid for low-income persons.

China 'facts' assailed

Please excuse me for appearing again on these pages, but I fear that my turf has been trampled upon by some apologists for the "Republic of China" on Taiwan. As a teacher of Chinese history, I cannot stand in silent toleration of the misrepresentation of facts which appeared in your "Opinion" column of October 16.

Item: "Dr. Sun Yat-sen... founded the Republic of China (on) Oct. 10, 1911." Actually, Sun was in Denver, Colo., when the revolution against China's last emperor broke out on Oct. 10. He read about it in the newspapers, then returned to China slowly, via Europe, in time for the actual founding of the Republic, Jan. 1, 1919.

Item: "More than 60 million Chinese people on the mainland were killed by the communists as counter-revolutionaries. This popular 60 million figure is derived by adding all casualties, direct and indirect, on all sides, in all wars (including the war against Japan) and civil war in China since the founding of the Chinese Communist Party in 1921.

Possibly 60 million did die -- but most were killed by the Japanese and the "Nationalist" Chinese, whose love of the people was reflected in their twice blowing up the Yellow River dikes (first to stop the Japanese, then to stop the Communists) at the expense of flooding thousands of square miles of farmland and farmers.

Regrettably, even a student in our Asian Studies program, Jim Carroll, has his facts all mixed up. He says he was one year old "when Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang ("Nationalist" Party) threw the Germans out of China and sided with the U.S. and England.

I assume he means the onset of World War II. But Chiang hardly threw out the Germans: they were providing the military advisers for his attempt to destroy the communists and establish a fascist state--a desire which Chiang made explicit in the 1930s before his joining the Allied cause against the Axis made open advocacy of fascism a bit undiplomatic.

The Germans left China only after the forming of the Rome-Tokyo-Berlin axis and not because Chiang threw them out, but because the Japanese pressured Hitler to withdraw his support for China's "Nationalist" Government, which Japan was trying to destroy.

But the heart of the letter from the Taiwan students is the allegation that the Communists undermined the "Nationalist" Government during and after the War of Resistance with Japan.

There is no question that Communist power grew enormously during the war against Japan, but it grew because the Communists were vigorously fighting a "peoples war" of guerrilla warfare and social reform in the villages of North China, while the Nationalist Government was half-heartedly fighting a defensive, positional war whose main object was to survive, amass as much American aid as possible, and smash the Communists in the civil war which they expected to follow American victory over Japan in the Pacific.

Not only does an enormous weight of American scholarship document the success of Communist guerrilla warfare against Japan--in contrast to the corruption, bureaucratism, conservatism and decay of the "Nationalist" Government--but the Japanese war records show that it was the Communists who were their most stubborn enemies.

Finally, the authors offer the old saw that captured Japanese weapons, given the Communists by the Russians who occupied Manchuria in the last days of the war, allowed the Communists to defeat the Nationalists in the Civil War. One need only note that U.S. aid to the "Nationalist" Government was incomparably greater, and that the chief of the U.S. Army Advisory Group to the "Nationalist" said in 1948, as the forces he was advising



crumbled before the tough, popularly-supported communist army: "No battle has been lost since my arrival due to lack of ammunition or equipment."

The "Nationalists" lost in China because their regime of military officers, Shanghai bankers, urban intellectuals and conservative landlords lacked any popular base of support.

The Communists had (and have) that support, and with it have transformed the backward, oppressive, inflation-ridden China of the "Nationalist" party in a progressive, egalitarian, socialist state whose continuing rapid economic growth makes it a world power worthy of attention and understanding.

The students from Taiwan should, of course, be excused their ignorance of many of these facts. I have lived on that island where martial law poses as a "free way of life." I am well aware of the human rights violations which have earned it condemnation by Amnesty International and others. And I also know that the one-party Kuomintang dictatorship there does not allow access to sources on the modern history of China beyond the self-serving publications of the Kuomintang Party itself.

But we have other sources available here which allow us to disprove their misreading of history. I'd welcome these students coming to read such material in my classes: from their letter, I'd say they have quite a lot to learn about modern Chinese history.

Joseph Esherick,
associate professor, history

'Ugly statement' irks trio

With growing disgust we watch the stalemate in the negotiations between the University administration and the Graduate Teaching Fellowship Federation (GTFF).

While we understand the importance of such negotiations to both parties involved, we feel it is also necessary to understand the plight of an additional party -- the students.

Our position is classically between the rock and the hardspot. Any support given to the GTFF's cause by the students, means neglecting an important group investment

--our own education. And because investing in an education is so costly these days, it puts a greater burden on us all to really get our monies worth.

It is unfortunate that some of the GTFF's members fail to consider our position.

Along with our misgivings about these items, we are further angered by other unprofessional and inappropriate actions. These include a recent bombardment of harrangue during classtime; along with distribution of GTFF propaganda, urging the support of students; and the classless act that members of the GTFF have taken up of name calling.

We have had one GTFF explain the make-up of our possible substitutes, calling them, "slimy graduates", and "know-nothing lizards". We feel that these sorts of actions by a professional organization display a very immature method with which to solicit support.

While our sincerest hopes are for a satisfactory settlement prior to a strike, we hope the GTFF understands our lack of support, due to these actions.

Courtney Sapin
sophomore, psychology

Marc Smiley,
sophomore, journalism

Greg Harris,
sophomore, business

letters policy

The Emerald will accept and try to print all letters and opinion columns containing fair comment on ideas and topics of concern or interest to the University community. Letters and opinions will be run on a first-come, first-served basis. Both letters and opinion columns must be typewritten, using 65 character margins, and should be triple-spaced. Letters and opinions must be signed and the author's field of study (or faculty status) noted.