

Professor contests U.S.-Korea analysis

A perennial question in economic development debates is whether living standards in poor countries are likely to improve more rapidly in capitalist, export-oriented economies that welcome and even subsidize foreign corporate investment or in socialist, self-sufficient economies that place severe restraints on such investments.

Tim Shorrock's recent two-part analysis (The Emerald, April 30 and May 1) touches on this question with reference to South Korea and also raises additional questions regarding U.S. military assistance to that country. His analysis rests on a number of perceptions that I would like to challenge.

Perception #1: President Carter and the U.S. Congress have recently acted to increase U.S. military aid to South Korea despite "well-documented violations of human rights by the Park government and the Koreagate bribery scandal." This policy, together with administrative rhetoric about the threat of North Korean aggression, "is resulting in a permanent division of the peninsula."

Comment: Clearly, the Park regime is a *de facto* dictatorship that suppresses political freedom in South Korea. Nonetheless, it is considerably less oppressive than the comprehensive Stalinist rule in the north of Kim Il-sung, a

gentleman who has indeed long aspired to unify Korea — so long as the new unified nation accepts *his* power and *his* ideology!

Given the historical record and the opposing economic orientations of the two Koreas — thorough-going government ownership and control in the North and private property and enterprise in the South — it seems quizzical to believe that any "reunification process," except by war, is likely to make headway in the near future, regardless of the presence or absence of 38,000 American troops.

As R.N. Clough has recently observed "the presence of the U.S. combat forces in South Korea demonstrates that the United States continues to take a deep interest not only in that nation's security but also, more generally, in continued peace in Northeast Asia. Koreans have not forgotten that it was the total withdrawal of U.S. combat forces from South Korea in 1949 and the apparent ebbing of U.S. concern about the country that set the state for the outbreak of the Korean War in 1950."

A pullout on the lines initially suggested by Mr. Carter during his election campaign (which he saw as a vote-getting proposal at the time) would (a) tempt the North to attack the South before the latter become

militarily invulnerable; (b) push weapons; (c) disturb the Chinese, whose efforts to cultivate relations with the United States and Japan would be undermined by a Korean conflict.

Perception #2: American corporations, including a number based in Oregon, have taken advantage of the favorable business climate in South Korea to invest in factories there producing such items as textiles, clothing, footwear, plywood, and television sets for export. The profits realized have been extracted at the expense of Korean workers who, quite simply, are being exploited by the growth of the (largely foreign financed) manufacturing sector.

Comment: Foreign enterprises setting up factories in Korea have certainly prospered. But their profits have hardly been at the expense of their Korean workers. On the contrary, employment opportunities and real wages have risen at an unprecedented rate in South Korea over the past 15 years. Since 1972, alone, the average real wage rate there has risen by over 120 percent compared with a mere five percent in this country. (The Marxist view that business profits are at the expense of "the workers" could hardly have a more vivid refutation.)

Perception #3: The rapid

growth of South Korea's export-oriented manufacturing sector has forced Korean farmers and their families "to seek low-paying jobs in the cities and manufacturing zones" . . . "Once the 'rice bowl' of the peninsula, South Korea is now dependent for \$200 million of wheat a year from U.S. grain corporations."

Comment: In fact, South Korea's output of rice in 1977 was two-thirds greater than its output in 1967 and nearly three times greater than in 1957. The South Korean government has provided substantial subsidies to its farmers by fixing the farm-price of rice well above going world levels and by selling them fertilizer at prices below cost.

Here is how W.E. Skillend, Reader in Korean, University of London, (writing in Asian Affairs, Feb. 1978, P. 22) describes the current Korean agricultural situation:

"Anyone visiting nowadays the countryside which he knew more than, say, 15 years ago, finds the transformation almost unbelievable. The improvement in the standard of rural life is indeed noticeable from year to year, and government figures which show that rural family incomes exceeded on average urban family incomes in 1976 are entirely credible. Simply things like small local reservoirs for controlling the supply of water to paddies, or halls where

villagers may meet, which incredibly had never existed in most villages before, now serve their useful purposes.

Local roads are now paved and give quick and easy access to a national network of highways, so that farm products can be sold everywhere at something like the prices which are paid for them in the cities. (The farmers) are grateful to the government for the aid it has given, but above all for having allowed and encouraged the (New Communities) movement by farmers to free themselves of the oppression of petty officials and landowners."

Mr Shorrock has suggested (1) that a U.S. military pullout from South Korea would promote peaceful unification of the Korean peninsula; (2) that the U.S. military presence in South Korea stems primarily from pressure by American interests determined to safeguard their profits; (3) that U.S. and other foreign investment in Korea has done nothing to improve South Korean living standards; and (4) that South Korean agriculture has suffered as a result of that country's economic-development policies. In my view, all of these propositions are false.

Henry Goldstein
professor, political science

Men: Consider Rally

Inducement, not humiliation, elicits the primary motivation for the following statement: considering that the current enrollment figures are correct, I can assume, unfortunately, that a lack of virility due to fear of inadequacy is present among the University population. This assumption, evidently, is expediently useful, not as a chagrin (as already noted), but rather as a liaison for coercion of the male students.

The 1978-79 Rallymen gave a manifestation of a Rally Squad ranking number 17 in national competition, overwhelmingly disproving the "limp wrist" stereotypes of some cheerleaders. A Rallyman's wrists must be strong enough to press and support a beautiful lady above his head; not to mention the awareness, control, and self motivation needed to perform such "manly" actions.

I personally challenge anyone to check one's strength and weight supporting ability in a handstand position for five minutes or so *without* any external help (such as a wall or an assistant).

I realize that by writing this article I am subjecting myself to criticism. However, as I have noted earlier, this article is used only to persuade and encourage interested, adventurous, mature, talented, confident, motivated, and capable men to consider a noteworthy team, the University of Oregon Rally Squad, not to prove one's virility, but rather to disprove many misconceptions of Rallymen.

Darius Mrkoncic
sophomore, psychology

Power Play

The Oregon House of Representatives recently passed HB 2570. This bill places a moratorium on any new nuclear power plants until a safe repository for



waste is in operation. Our representatives passed this bill after much public input. They realize the people of Oregon want and deserve safety in the nuclear industry.

This proposed bill now goes to the Senate to be approved. We, as concerned citizens, must keep giving it our support. Senator Ed Fadeley, chair of the Senate Environment and Energy Committee is a proponent of this bill but is now beginning to falter. For a safe Oregon please call or write or write your Senator and Senator Fadeley expressing your support of HB 2570.

The toll free phone number is 1-800-452-7813. The address is State Capitol, Salem Oregon, 97310. Through public support public safety can be gained.

Patty Goodin
sophomore, undeclared

'Not equivalent'

Greek living is not the equivalent to dorm living and yes, you try in a perverted way to be social elites. First you have your selective rush where you cut those who do not appear to fit your standards at excellence. You also strictly maintain your secret initiations, handshakes, oaths — all ritualistic examples of selective exclusivism. Your dress standards are competitive in nature and reflect your primary drives towards materialistic elitism. How hard it is to spot a CRAPA on a Saturday night (What in the world would they do without *Cosmopolitan*?)

When I first attended this school in the late 1960s Greekism was dying, materialism was out and social consciousness and inclusiveness in. It was great tribute to a great generation who

rejected preparatory junior country clubs. It's sad that many students have drifted back to "what does your dad do" in place of "What do you do?"

The personals in the Emerald are the worst reminders of the sorority girls' Barbie Doll mentality. Now all you read is cutsey little jingles, "sweet as spice, and isn't that nice, whose ass did you kiss today?"

I much preferred the good old days reading, "Guy in the green shirt, Taylors Saturday night, I think I gave you the clap. Meet you at the health center at four!" I was able to save my friend's life.

The smucks of the fifties didn't know any better, the Greeks of the Seventies should. What's your excuse Suzy, Brad, and Jeff?

Dennis Warren
graduate, education
Thursday, May 17, 1979