



to the editor

Dear editor:

Bruce Nelson's arguments (*Daily Nebraskan*, Feb. 3) are merely a rationalization of the attitude "let them pull themselves up by their bootstraps," while, of course, most Indians have no boots.

Let me respond to some of his comments:

(1) Birth Control: It is hard not to agree that birth control information and devices need to be more available in India and elsewhere. However, Indian budget-planners must make decisions between birth control and food, birth control and essential industry, and so on. In a country with limited resources many need go unmet. This argues for more, not less, aid to meet such needs.

(2) Hinduism. In our largely Christian country people indulge in feeding large numbers of dogs and cats while leaving children to go hungry. What should be our penalty, given our greater resources for feeding people?

(3) Nuclear reactors. For non-peaceful purposes, these are a waste. They are no less a waste in the U.S. The U.S. is also in a much stronger position to guarantee security and to limit nuclear weapons than a border-threatened, poor country like India. How much progress have we made in the thirty years?

None of this is to argue that the Indian government might not be more efficient and more sensitive to the needs of its people. Unfortunately, this is true of our government even though our country has the resources to solve many of our problems. This brings us to the basic question: do human beings have any responsibilities to others less well off than they? And if Nelson were starving, would he wish to be ignored because of the government above him, his religion or his non-use of birth control?

Genie Gupta

More facts bantered

Dear editor:

Mr. Nelson, in his editorial of Feb. 3, seems immature in judgement, sarcastic in the face of human deprivation and incapable of completing the local paradigm he starts.

If one wishes to banter facts, here are a few more:

From 1945 to 1969, U.S. grants in aid to India totaled \$7,788 million. During the same period West Germany, Great Britain and France received \$13,728 million in U.S. aid. India had a population estimated at 442 million living upon 1,269,952 square miles. The population for the three European states totaled 146 million on 389,135 square miles. The population densities are similar, yet the Indians receive only \$17.30 per capita compared with \$93.38 for the Europeans. A real cynic might ask, "Why the discrepancy? Are not all needy men equally deserving of our Christian benevolence?"

Could the difference be based upon the fact that U.S. general imports from Western Europe totalled \$10,139 million in 1968 but only \$344 million from India?

A true cynic might further point out the different usages aid money was put to in India and West Europe. Much of the Indian grant was made in surplus munitions. American aid after World War I simply rearmed the belligerents from World War II. Now Europe is once again an armed camp.

It is too cynical to say that the arms race has led us to the brink of environmental degradation and is a major cause of the inflation we are enjoying at present? Would we not have more money to put into agricultural research if we stopped feeding the Pentagon's of the world?

The basic fault in Mr. Nelson's reasoning is that sheer hypocrisy of his stand. The U.S. is rich in agricultural products and technologies. India is poor in these areas, ergo, India must starve. But if we are to expect self-sufficiency from other nations, let us first see what sort of example the U.S. sets.

America has a very big lesson to learn. This is a global community now and if any mankind is going to survive it must be by redognizing the moral responsibilities that tie us all. A cynic might say that each year sees the thickening of the callous upon the soul of America when it can be readily suggested that we no longer feel "guilty about starving children with distended bellies."

W.R. Flaughter

Nuclear power still debated

(Editor's note: Rob Aiken is chairman of the ASUN Environmental Task Force.)

After World War II ended with Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) was created to explore other uses for nuclear power. Energy production is one use for nuclear power that is hotly debated in the academic and political arena.

According to *U.S. Energy Policies*, a study by Resources for the Future, the AEC became increasingly involved in civilian nuclear energy in the mid-50s. By 1962 the AEC had used \$1.275 billion for civilian nuclear research—each year an additional \$500 million went to nuclear reactor development.

The AEC first cultivated the fission reactor which uses uranium and thorium as fuel. Now work is being done to develop more efficient breeder reactors—projected by an Iowa consultant to be available in about 20 years.

The first big reactor was constructed on the east coast in 1962, according to *U.S. Energy Policies*, beginning a proliferation of nuclear power plants in the mid-60s. In 1968 two reactors, Ft. Calhoun and Cooper, were under construction in eastern Nebraska and are among the 44 reactors now licensed to operate (source: Committee for Nuclear Responsibility—Calif.).

This rapid acceptance of nuclear power by utilities has grown into dependence on nuclear

power. Our energy needs are expanding 3.8 per cent each year, according to a Chase Manhattan Bank study. By 1990, the Federal Power Commission projects nuclear energy will provide half our energy.

Twenty-eight years after the first large reactor was built, nuclear power is expected to dominate energy production.

Could this promise for the future develop into a Pandora's box of magic tricks? How could utility companies become committed to a system not satisfactorily tested in the field? (*The Wall Street Journal* reported last week that 21 reactors, including one in Nebraska, will be shut down for up to two weeks to check for cracks in the primary cooling system.) Why do a number

ASUN opinion

of American, German and Swedish scientists recommend broad restrictions or moratoriums on nuclear reactor operations? What effect does existing and projected nuclear power have on Nebraska?

We hope to explore these questions in future articles before the March 6 public hearing on a bill to place a moratorium on further reactor development in Nebraska.

Intelligence quotient high

Seeing that everyone else is investigating The Intelligence Community these days, I thought I'd drop by the place myself.

As you probably know, The Intelligence Community is located on the outskirts of Reality. You can't miss it. There's a road sign saying "Intelligence, Pop. 764,591," and above that a banner emblazoned "WATCH US GROW!"

I was greeted at the gate by a jovial man who handed me a card identifying himself as Herbert Galosh, president of the community's Booster Club. "Welcome, welcome," he said, "fellow spy."

"Fellow spy?" I said. "But..."

"No one comes here but spies," said Galosh. "And is our tourist business booming! White House Commissions, Congressional committees, investigative journalists... You wouldn't believe how many Americans are spying on us Americans in The Intelligence Community. Not that we have anything against that. 'If you can't expose a Russian,' we say, 'expose an American.' But what would you like to know?"

"Well, for starters," I said, "what exactly do you do here in The Intelligence Community?"

"Why, we gather intelligence," said Galosh. "It's the greatest growth industry in the country. You should've seen this place 50 years ago—a forgotten hamlet with a few hundred souls."

"And look at us today. Booming! Now over there you can see our workers in the field gathering intelligence while they happily sing their favorite spiritual, 'You'll Never Know.' And over here's our sorting plant where we separate genuine information from scurrilous rumors about prominent people."

"And you burn the latter?" I asked.

"Oh, no," said Galosh, "we always send that to the President. The rest, however, is taken to our processing mills where it is spun out,

cross-carded and woven into plots. Do you realize that in the last fiscal year alone we produced 13.2 metric tons of information? Who says our free society can't compete with totalitarian nations?"

"But what do you do with it?" I asked.

Galosh looked surprised. "Why, we store it, of course," he said. "Today, thanks to our efforts, America has more surplus intelligence than any other country in the world."

"An enviable record," I said. "To what do you attribute your success?"

arthur hoppe

innocent bystander

"To the free enterprise system," said Galosh. "Competition's the key. We now have 60 different agencies competing for intelligence. Look at that marvelous scramble over there! That's the CIA, the FBI and the IRS fighting gallantly over a piece of intelligence, while the poor Bureau of Weights & Measures Intelligence Agency lurks on the side-lines, hoping for a scrap. Frankly, that's the main problem we face: There just isn't enough intelligence in this community to go around."

I thanked Galosh for his tour and asked if I couldn't have a secret to take home as a souvenir. "Certainly," he said. "Who's in charge here?" "Great!" I said. "Who is in charge here?" "That," he said, clapping me warmly on the back and ushering me out the gate, "is a real secret for you."

(Copyright Chronicle Publishing Co. 1975)