

It worked

Well, last week's editorial must have worked, or anyway something did. A turnout of 353 voters for a runoff election in a student government campaign is almost unheard of. And it just goes to prove that students here aren't apathetic and that they do care about what happens to their school.

This is particularly gratifying because it shows that students here are a cut above those at many other schools when it comes to involvement.

We receive student papers from all the other community colleges in Oregon and they are all filled with editorials ranting about student apathy, stories about candidates running unopposed for student government offices and lack of student interest in such things as tuition increases.

The election turnout and the response to the debates held last Thursday and Friday proves that students at the College do care and are willing to get involved if the opportunity is presented to them.

We are especially proud to be able to report these things this week because this paper will be read by those ASG and journalism students who will be visiting here this weekend for workshops.

One more thing. We would like to present this challenge to next year's ASG. Students have proven that they are not apathetic and now it's up to you to maintain the level of involvement shown in these last two elections.

You can no longer fall back on the old excuse that students don't care and there is nothing you can do about it. We agree with Richard Weiss that publicity about student government has maintained too low a profile. And we maintain that it is not up to the paper to provide all the publicity. Student government is not the only thing we have to cover. We suggest that you get your act together for next year and give students a government that they can be proud of.

After all, they have shown that they are interested.



weather station

By Jim McCaffrey
Of The Print

N E S T L E ' S, Nestlé's Makes the Very best BABY KILLERS.

This is a country where people speculate cynically about where our industrialized society is leading. People seem to have accepted that profit is the main motivation of our world. People accept the fact that this motivation has bought about the means to foul our air, kill our streams, waste our wildlife and infringes constantly on personal freedom.

Lust for profit has economically raped and pillaged poor countries for centuries. Most of the time the slow process of rape is carried on quietly in these dark streets of those countries that are ghetto's of our global neighborhood. Even when the cries of the ravaged victim are loudest very few will listen. Occasionally, though, the profit motive will by its nature, bring about a scheme so vile, that in no sense can it be tolerated accepted or excused.

Listen, damnit listen. The nature of this story is so stinking awful. I swear to you that Nestlé's (yes, your favorite movie chocolate) is killing babies. These babies are sacrifices to Nestlé on the altar of profit. Hear this story. Tell it to a friend. Get angry if you can. Most important, Act.

Around the beginning of 1960's there was a general concern among baby formula manufacturers that the baby market was going to be declining in the next few years as it appeared that the baby boom had tapered off. Looking to alternatives to western markets, the baby food companies, most notably Nestlé's and Bristol-Myers, began to heavily promote their products in underdeveloped and third world countries.

These promotions took the form of heavy use of billboards and newspaper ads pitching Nestlé's Lactogen and Bristol-Myers Enfamil as the modern equivalent of mothers milk. The products were promoted to be as good as, or better for the baby, as mother's milk.

Mothers were being convinced by the companies that the most modern, efficient and healthy method of feeding their baby was through the use of their product. On top of these promotions the milk companies provided free samples of their product at hospitals that were

given out along with pamphlets on the care and feeding of babies.

Since the hospitals feed the babies the formula during hours when the mothers don't nurse and, since up to a two week free sample is given when the patient is discharged, the free samples are seen by the patient as being endorsed by the hospitals.

Still not satisfied, the companies employ a large group of representatives who may or may not have medical training, who dress and act like nurses and go around to houses of the mothers to weigh the babies and offer advice on their care and feeding. Often, of course, the baby formula will be offered as the best method of feeding.

The net results of these high powered ad campaigns is that the corporations have taken over one billion dollars a year in profits out of the third world countries and left in their stead death and disease.

The first thing the mother finds our after she has used up her free two week sample of the miracle formula is that her breasts have dried up and she can no longer give milk. The second rude surprise is that in a family that averages \$3 a day take home pay, it is going to cost 75 cents to buy formula for the baby. Thus mothers are forced to make cans of milk that are recommended to last four days last anywhere from six days to three weeks.

Usually the mothers have only one bottle and one nipple and, because of the high cost of fuel, neither they nor the terrible water is adequately boil-

ed. The formula lacks the benefits of proteins and disease immunity that mother's milk provides. There is of course no refrigeration for the milk.

The result of these conditions is malnutrition and a severe form of diarrhea. The diseases are marked by the sunken eyes, prominent ribs and thin arms and legs that are associated with scenes from Bangladesh. Just as horrid as the uncounted deaths, another affect to those who manage to survive is undetermined amounts of brain damage to many who had protein deficient diets.

The individual cans of milk average about 72 percent profit on each can of formula. Just where is the point where each of us must demand corporate responsibility? It is obvious that there are morals involved with promoting an unnecessary product to a chronically poor people. How can corporations be insensitive to the fact that they are simply too poor and too ignorant to use their products safely? Why must corporations instead insist on exploiting them?

If you are as outraged about these practices as I am please let your voice be heard. Please Boycott Nestlé's products. These products include Taster's Choice/ Nescafe/ Nestlé's Quick/ Nestlé's Crunch/ Nestea/ Libby's/ Libby's & McNeill.

If you feel that you can scream a bit louder then write these vile and insensitive S.O.B.'s. The addresses are: Bristol Myers, 345 Park Ave., New York, N.Y. 10022 & Nestlé Co. Inc., 100 Bloomingdale Rd. White Plains N.Y. 10615.

Commentary

The great debate

By Rick Ingram
For The Print

"Discussion is now open for questions from the floor. "Yes you in the black hat."

"Mr. Wees, you have been accused of unethical practices, and I was wondering if it's true that your grandfather's dog was a Communist?"

"That rumor is completely erroneous-he was a cocker spaniel."

"Next question, yes, you in the gym suit."

"Uh, like, uh, Mr. McCarthy, like ya know, how do you, ya know, feel about football?"

"Well, as you all know, I was an athletic supporter my entire term and I think we need a football program here."

"Great questions folks, okay whose next?"

"Mr. Wees, can you justify killing trees for the sake of name familiarity, and if so will your posters be recycled?"

"Yes and Yes"...

"Conspi-racy - Conspiracy".

"Oh shut up!"

"Hit him."

"Next question, the gentlemen sitting where the lightning just struck."

"Mr. McCarthy, could you pass the salt please?"

"Yes".

"I'd like to thank all of you

for these fine questions. Okay who's next?"

"This question is directed to both candidates; do either of you use Gleemo toothpaste?"

"After brief discussion we both feel that that is a personal question and neither of us would like to answer it."

"You in the sequins, what's your question?"

"Mr. Wees, do you feel that if you're running for an office you should research and become familiar with all aspects of the office and that you should be prepared to discuss all issues, pertaining to the office, in a fair and open forum where opinions can be expressed freely?"

"Yes"

"Moving right along-questions please. Yes, the young man in the rear."

"To both candidates, should we be nice to our mothers."

"I will arbitrarily give that question, arbitrarily, to me. McCarthy."

"Yes we should."

"Well, I see our time is up and most of you have finished your meals, so let's all get out there and vote, vote, vote."

(This debate was sponsored by the Committee to Re-Elect the President).

Any relationship between characters depicted herein and persons either living or dead, is entirely coincidental.

the print

19600 S. Molalla Avenue, Oregon City, Oregon 97045
Offices: Trailer B -- Telephone: 656-2631, ext. 259 or 278

editor Hattie Thacker * news editor Cyndi Bacon * arts editor Lisa Chitty * sports editor Ann Breyne * copy editor Scott Starnes * photo editor Brian Snook * staff writers Randy Frank, Jim McCaffrey, Mary Madeland, Shawn Parkhurst * photographers * Sam Baer, Ted McKenna * assistant photo editor * Lorraine Stratton * production manager Mary Cuddy * business manager * Paul Byers * professional advisor * Randy Clark office personnel * Crystal Tompkins, Tommi Davidson

The Print, a member of the Oregon Newspaper Publishers Association, aims to be a fair and impartial journalistic medium covering the campus community as thoroughly as possible. We encourage participation through letters, free lance articles and story ideas and suggestions. Deadlines are the Friday of the week prior to the Wednesday publication date.

Wednesday, May 17, 1978

