

Korea critic responds to professor's letter

Professor Goldstein's attack (ODE May 17) on my U.S.-Korea analysis (ODE April 30, May 1) is reminiscent of the State Department's rosy descriptions of Iran under American tutelage, or the Pentagon version of Vietnam. On the basis of three statistics and two rather arbitrary quotes, he believes he has proven that South Korea is a nation of satisfied workers and happy farmers, free of exploitation and therefore worthy of U.S. military protection. I would like to challenge his perceptions and his conclusions.

Perception #1: First, the passage Mr. Goldstein quotes implying that the U.S. "withdrawal" in 1949 set the stage for the Korean War is such a simplistic and gross distortion of history that I can only urge interested readers to study the postwar history of Korea and decide for themselves.

Second, Mr. Goldstein ignores the question I posed in my article, namely that the massive amount of U.S. military aid far outweighs the need for "protection" from the North. Third, Mr. Goldstein shows a common misperception of South Korea when he contrasts its "private" economy to the "government controlled" economy of the North.

Let me quote from a 1978 World Bank report: In (South) Korea the government's role is considerably more direct than that of merely setting the broad rules of the game and influencing the economy indirectly through market forces. In fact, the government seems to be a participant and *often the determining influence* in nearly all business decisions." (Italics mine.)

Fourth, Mr. Goldstein does not show much concern for those whose political freedom is suppressed by the "de facto" dictatorship. Nor does he give any indication that reunification *should* be a goal.

Fifth, it is important to remember that U.S. forces are the *only* foreign troops on Korean soil. Park certainly has the military strength to defend himself.

Perception #2: As the commander of the joint U.S.-Korea military forces has said, "U.S. forces are located in the Republic of Korea to serve the interests of the United States." I think this statement speaks for itself, that the nature of these interests is quite obvious.

Perception #3: The 120 percent rise in Korean real wages, which Mr. Goldstein mentioned, has barely outpaced the rise in productivity. It also represents a rise in the monthly average wage from \$46 to \$170. According to the South Korean newspaper Dong-A-Ilbo (currently under control of the government), last August 395,600 workers were receiving a monthly wage of \$66; 76 percent of women in the Federation of Korean Trade Unions were receiving less than \$104. The government recommended minimum living standard is \$163.

Mr. Goldstein neglects to say why union activities are under such strict control. Or why, if workers are so pleased with their jobs, they have illegally gone on strike, demonstrated, gone to jail, even committed suicide in protest against their low wages, poor working conditions and harassment.

Perception #4: South Korean

agriculture has been vertically integrated into the country's export-first economy through the "New Community Movement." A "co-op" institution controlled by the government, the movement serves as a network for the sale of and a vehicle for propagating Park Chung Hee's ideology. The movement was a response to the terrible poverty and underdevelopment in the rural areas caused by the rapid development of export industrialization.

By controlling market and distribution channels, the government has control over crop decisions. Thus, while rice production has increased, production of other crops has declined. And only one variety of rice is being grown: a high yield strain that requires large amounts of chemical fertilizers. Between 1968 and 1975, there was an eight-fold increase in the use of poisonous chemicals.

This overconsumption to increase production has resulted in mercury poisoning to farm families; and DDT, mercury, lead, and copper have been found in grain supplies throughout the country. Gulf Oil, Dow Chemical, and Swift Agricultural Chemical have reaped handsome profits from these policies. Despite Korea's self-sufficiency in rice, it still imports U.S. surplus rice.

But Government "supports" have actually profited the government, not the farmers. According to the Catholic Farmers Association, fertilizer is sold to farmers at double the production costs. And in 1978, the average loss to the farmer per 50 kilogram bag of rice was \$31; while the government price is below

production costs — largely due to the expensive fertilizer. As a result, farmer debt has quintupled since 1970.

Farmers are so "grateful" for the co-ops that in 1977 407,000 people migrated to the cities from the rural areas.

Conclusion: The question I would like to raise is "Does 'export-oriented industrialization' constitute development?" Does the existence of low-paying jobs offered by foreign investment represent opportunities for national economic growth? Technology transfer? Independence? Democracy?

These are complex issues, and there are no simple answers: even China is building free trade zones for foreign investors. My concern is for the people who — in the words of the Canadian historian E.H. Norman — are "crushed by the wheels of history." I believe it is the responsibility of Americans to take an honest look at the impact of capitalist industrialization and American-style modernization on developing countries.

To downplay the negative impact by pointing a finger at "more oppressive" Communist regimes avoids the basic issues. Apologists for U.S. policy like Mr. Goldstein seem to forget that Koreans, Nicaraguans, Iranians and other peoples throughout the world are also human beings who want to live decent lives free of exploitation and foreign domination. Like the British discovered 200 years ago, people will struggle even against a "benevolent" colonial power — for these elemental human rights.

Tim Shorrock
graduate, Asian studies
Korea Information Action Project

'Quacks' embarrass University

The "Senior Quacks," with a name certainly far from invoking a mature, responsible image, have chosen, by their own vote, to represent the graduating class of 1979. The "Quacks" have taken it upon themselves to protest Governor Atiyeh speaking June 10, 1979 at the commencement exercises.

Their contention, as I understand it, is that Victor Atiyeh is an anti-environmentalist Republican who is pro-utilities, pro-nuclear power, pro-business and completely unresponsive to the common people. "Quackers," for substantiation, hold up Atiyeh's voting record on herbicides, his post-election meetings with the utilities, his refusal to speak at the recent "anti-nuke" rally in Salem, and his poor showing at the University area polls (Atiyeh received only 25 percent of the votes).

Certainly no one can argue with these facts and I would even be willing to agree that Governor Atiyeh was not a choice representative of the students desires. However, in their rush and fervor to damn Vic Atiyeh, the "Quacks" are losing sight of the image we, as graduating seniors, must present to our future employers and fellow workers.

Victor Atiyeh is the Governor of this state: he was elected by a majority vote of the very people who pay the taxes that enable this institution to operate. Furthermore, Mr. Atiyeh was invited by President Boyd who is a representative of us, the students. Mr. Boyd, in a May 21 letter to the editor, has agreed

that he acted without proper consultation of the student body and has promised that in the future more emphasis will be placed on the wishes of the graduating class.

It is my opinion that we would put aside our political differences and accept with dignity the honor which Governor Atiyeh is paying us by speaking at our graduation. I, for one, do not want to have my graduating class represented as a rude arrogant collection of "quacks" who deliberately offended the Governor of our state and embarrassed the President of our college.

Rocky Johnson
senior, business
administration

God wants 'review'

In reference to Mr. Wilson's letter concerning the Metropolitan Community Church (5/25/79). He stated the MCC undercut the authority of the Bible in order to give itself the freedom to choose what to believe and what to reject, and that "It is ludicrous to think that the God who created the universe could not keep His Word from being altered or lost over time."

Thank goodness Mr. Wilson is not a theologian. He makes it seem as if questioning and interpreting the Bible (which theologians do) is heretical.

I, for one, do not think it is ludicrous or sinful to question the Bible. Neither do many theologians who question and reject those same passages Mr. Wilson so piously quoted.



Everyone rejects certain parts of the Bible. I doubt very much if Mr. Wilson has not (or will not ever again) shave or wear anything of cotton, yet the Bible prohibits these things. So who is he to condemn other people for rejecting certain parts of the Bible? Criticizing people for rejecting certain parts of the Bible should have ended with criticizing the Jewish people for not accepting the New Testament.

To say it is ludicrous and hypocritical to reject certain parts of the Bible is a heavy-handed way of inhibiting people from showing differing viewpoints about religion. I believe instead, that God gave us the power to question and debate

about the Bible, precisely because God knew mortal men would alter His Word over the centuries. God meant us to review the context of the Bible, so that His Word would not be lost or altered.

Matthew Kincaide
sophomore, French

'Untrue and unjust'

The Emerald article about me on May 24 may have left the impression that I have done something wrong. I don't think shouting "no" to a child who is hurting other children is wrong.

The discipline policy at the Child Care and Development Center clearly says in writing that repeated acts of aggres-

sion are to be countered with time-outs. Since there were no teachers supervising the children, I disciplined the child in the official manner with no aggression in my actions.

The untrue and unjust accusations have been made about me in retaliation because I insisted that the center stop feeding the babies belladonna and threatened to report them to the authorities.

I would like the Emerald to fully investigate and correct the doubts that have been created about my character.

Thank you.

Melanie Rapoport
senior, linguistics