

Editorials

Sponsors detract from Olympics

When you think of the Olympics, the athletes and the games immediately come to mind. Athletes spend years preparing themselves for their events.

But amateur athletes are not the only people in the United States who take advantage of the Olympic competition. Probably more visible than the athletes in the competition between the advertisers — the "official Olympic sponsors."

The average person may not know the names of the U.S. figure skaters or other U.S. contenders, but most people recognize Budweiser as one of many official Olympic sponsors.

Campbell's is the official

Winter Olympics soup, Converse is the official running shoe, Chevrolet is the official car and truck, United is the official airline, Chapstick is the official lip balm, Centrum is the official vitamin, Levi's the official outfitter, K-Mart, McDonald's and Beatrice food products are all official sponsors.

After the events are over some of the same advertisers will then hire the Olympic winners to promote their products. Remember Bruce Jenner and Wheaties? Susie (Call-Me-Susie-Chapstick) Chafe? Peggy Fleming and Trident gum? Dorothy Hamill doing shampoo commercials?

In the capitalist spirit, businesses across the nation try to profit from the publicity and respect attached to the Olympic games.

Although the advertising helps bring the Olympics to many through the television, the use of the "official Olympic" title and Olympic symbol (five connected rings) with so many products cheapens and detracts from the respect held for the Olympics.

No doubt many people benefit from the support of the advertisers, but it is too bad they exploit the Olympics' name by creating their own competition for bids as "official Olympic sponsors."

Letters to the editor

Library realizes noise problem

To the Editor:

This letter is in response to numerous articles, letters and queries in the *Pendulum* and other campus sources. The library staff would like everyone to know that we are aware of the noise problem in the library. Perhaps the college community does not realize that floors are designated for group study (main floor) as well as quiet study (second and ground floors).

The librarians who work at night, when the noise level is the greatest, are available for basic reference help. In order to provide that help on the main floor, they do not have time to patrol the other floors of the library. As a result, we believe it is the responsibility

of each student to police himself and his peers. The librarians on duty are always willing to help maintain quiet when someone comes to them with a noise complaint.

If students would like to study in groups, then we suggest they use the empty classrooms on the second and third floors of Alamance. The Varsity Grill, game rooms and dormitory lounges are available to those students who wish to socialize.

We believe that the library is a place for serious study and research. We ask for your help in maintaining this philosophy. In addition, we solicit your comments and suggestions.

Al Jones, head librarian for the Library staff

EDB ban! 'no emergency'!

By Carol Nix Staff Writer

In 1974, the National Cancer Institution first warned that minute traces of EDB (ethylene dibromide) caused cancer in lab animals. By 1977, further studies linked the pesticides to genetic defects and reproductive disorders in humans.

The Environmental Protection Agency then began to take action and proposed to phase out the agricultural uses of EDB by giving the industry three years to find alternatives. Recently EDB has been banned from grocery store shelves in many states (such as Florida and California) in the form of cereals, cake mixes, flour and other grain foods. EPA Chief William Ruckelshaus has ordered an immediate halt to the use of EDB, which has been widely used to kill pests in agricultural products and in stored grains since 1948.

The adverse effects of EDB have evidently been known for quite some time, yet the first actions to elevate them from the public diet were not taken seriously until now. Newsweek magazine states that "earlier efforts to crack down on EDB were caught in regulatory tugs of war that pitted environmentalists against agriculturists, EPA against the Department of Agriculture and EPA scientists against each other." Perhaps such pressure slowed preventive measures down for such a long time. Consumers are not only scared by such actions, they are also growing weary of constant warnings concerning the health level of available and presumably safe products. The toleration of possible unsafe levels of EDB in our food products may be attributed to the apparent lack of knowledge concerning adverse effects of



the pesticide. This has caused confusion and chaos in EPA dealings and consumer health considerations.

Actions taken by the EPA naturally created public concern and apprehension, yet, with the authorities having no substantial information on EDB levels in consumer products, the need for previous action becomes predominate. The harmful effects of the pesticide have long been considered. Certainly ten years is enough time to draw some concrete statistics on such a widely used product in our diets! Perhaps the issue here moves from EDB to EPA.

If something is proven to be detrimental to the health of our nation, at any rate, the EPA must respond to preserve the protection and security of our nation's health. This agency, however, has chosen an attempt to divert the public's apprehensions by urging the

nation to "calm down". And although this substance has shown up over 77 grocery products, and officials have banned the use of EDHB, the EPA stresses that "even current levels of the substances pass no immediate danger to consumers." EPA Chief Ruckelshaus even stated that there is no emergency, but the banning of EDB is an effort to "eliminate a long-term, chronic and unacceptable health risk." The contradictions in this statement are as considerable as the damage done by the chaotic handling of this substance as a proposed health threat.

If a dangerous substance is open and widely used in consumer products, it is the EPA's duty to elevate it altogether. Obviously this obligation has been deferred. One cannot help but wonder about possible other cases of this nature that may further threaten our national health security.

Abortion questioned

To the Editor:

I viewed in horrified fascination the CBS *60 Minutes* documentary "No Brothers, No Sisters", on Feb. 12.

Was the intent to shock or repulse American viewers with Chinese enforcement of the one child per family quota instituted to check the overwhelming population growth?

Women deviating from this fledgling one-child Chinese mandate are coerced (or, when necessary, physically forced) to undergo abortions — to have the state kill their unborn babies!

How ghastly! Then, realization snapped in me like a dry, brittle twig.

Can we Americans really view the situation in China as more repugnant than our own society, where women by the millions, by their own free choice, exercise a state given right to kill their own unborn babies?

Which abortion is really ghastlier?

The one in which the mother is forced by the state to kill her unborn baby (through abortion), or the one in which the mother through her own free choice and will, with the aid of the State, chooses to snuff out the life of her unborn baby?

It's time we placid Americans wake up to the blunt realities of abortion.

At least the Chinese enfor-

cers tell it like it is. They call it killing in the stomach to keep the population down!

So much for blunt realities... "And why behold the note that is in the brother's eye, but consider not the beam that is in thine own eye?" (Matthew 7:3). Abortion is a disgrace to our nation. Wake up, America!

Bev Stadermann

The Pendulum Staff

Editor-in-Chief	Jo Craven
Associate Editor	Loukia Louka
Head Photographer	Paul Harris
Editorial Editor	Carol Nix
Features Editor	Penny Thomas
Arts Editor	Felicia Fogleman
Sports Editor	Danny Hubbard
Adviser	Robert Nowell

The Pendulum welcomes letters, limited to 250 words, from our readers. Longer material may be submitted as opinion articles. All letters submitted must be signed, and a phone number given so that the letters validity can be checked. Editors reserve the right to edit for length, libel, good taste and accuracy. Our office is located in 208 Long Student Center, phone 584-2331.

The paper is published by the Communications Media Board of Elon College. Founded on October 14, 1974, as the student newspaper serving the Elon College community. The Pendulum is published each Thursday during the regular terms except for examination and holiday periods. The Pendulum is printed by The Burlington Daily Times-News.