



A word of thanks

On behalf of the University of Oregon Survival Center and the Lane County "SUN DAY" Coalition, I'd like to thank all of the people who have worked very hard over the last few months to make Sun Day so successful in Lane County.

I'd also like to thank everyone who attended Sun Day events and supported our week of celebrational and educational solar events.

We hope that you've both enjoyed Sun Day and that you have come away with a bit more knowledge about the era of solar energy use dawning around you. (We also hope to see more solar collectors on your roofs!). Sun Day is only a start. There is still plenty of work for us to do in assuring proper implementation of solar energy policy and performance. Let's all keep working towards realizing an environmentally sound, safe and energy-efficient Lane County. May a long time, sun shine upon you.

Lawrence Kahn
of the Survival Center

Unbridled stupidity

Ballot Measure No. 51 has been passed resoundingly by the voters of Eugene, who have thereby created a very ugly image for the city and an even uglier precedent in the field of civil rights. By this action the noble residents of Eugene have:

- 1) taken it upon themselves to apply a majority-rules approach to something in which by definition the will of the majority has no place;
- 2) given themselves the unfortunate and quite erroneous impression that they and their in-many-ways outdated Biblical Christian ethic have by weight of numbers alone the right to determine the lifestyles and personal moral codes of those who do not share their insular and often neurotic views; and
- 3) done such damage to Oregon's, and Eugene's, liberal and progressive images that one day the comparisons that have been made between Measure 51 and the politics of early Nazi Germany may not be quite as overstated as they seemed to be, a day or two ago.

The success of Measure 51 is an example of what unbridled stupidity can do when those who suffer from it really try. I hope the proponents of Measure 51 are proud of themselves.

Michael Stamm
Graduate student, History

An inconsistency

On Tuesday, May 23 the people of Eugene voted almost 4 to 1 in favor of more "humane" control of putting unwanted animals to death.

On that the same day the people of Eugene voted almost 2 to 1 against human rights.

I guess that means animals are more "humane" than humans?

David Matthew
Freshman, Undeclared

New anthem?

America. I write, not as a radical, not as a man lost or without identity, but as a man who feels inspiration to the point at which he must act. I am a man, citizen of the United States of America, grateful of this country's ability to survive under a constitution willing of criticism. Criticism by great Americans that has made this country and its citizens strong and willing to do in their best interest.

Granted, no country is a perfect state of utopia. America does have a few problems. As Americans we strive to overcome these problems. Alas, we realize these problems will exist despite efforts to eliminate them. These are the mountains that refuse to budge against the strongest efforts.

But there are smaller mountains. Mountains that can be moved to make life for Americans happier and closer to the interest of all. With a little effort Americans can move a small mountain to make room for their best interest.

There exists what I consider a small mountain before every American citizen. This mountain was erected in 1931 by the U.S. Congress. Historians will be quick to note that this was the year Congress established Francis Scott Key's hit tune "The Star-Spangled Banner" as the USA's national anthem.

America, set aside your senti-

ment for a moment. Are you happy with "The Star-Spangled Banner" as our national anthem? How many songs do you sing that are over 150 years old? Why must an enthusiastic pre-game crowd be forced to "come down" and listen politely to an old, slow song? These questions raise many issues, but the point here is that Americans are given a song that generates little enthusiasm. The "Star-Spangled Banner" destroys the path of flowing enthusiasm, whether it be before a ballgame or at the beginning of a broadcast day.

What is needed is a song that keeps with the pace, generates enthusiasm, and is enjoyable to sing, too. The song I therefore propose as America's new national anthem is Supertramp's "Give a little bit." (Best when stoned with headphones.)

Consider these points. The song is an easy flowing blend of instrumentation and vocal establishing a feeling of involvement by those listening or singing along. The message is simple — merely asking one to "give a little bit . . . to show you care . . . now's the time we need to share." A message much more appropriate for our day and age than "The Star-Spangled Banner."

Imagine being able to phone your favorite radio station requesting the national anthem.

Imagine 10,000 people singing "Give a little" before a basketball game.

And finally, what better world gesture than to accept as our national anthem a song written by a British group.

Start digging America, and give a little bit.

Gregory L. Oberst
Junior, Telecommunication

Can't be convoluted

In his recent campus lectures, ex-Hindu priest and born-again Christian Rabi Maharaj gave a provocative response to the prevalent religious latitudinarianism expressed by the visiting Harvard professor and Taoist, Michael Sasa: the idea that mysticism is the lowest common denominator between all religions.

Maharaj reasoned against this "spirit of the times," saying that all religions are not alike, and that their conceptions of diety (along with the accompanying moral foundations) and personal goals radically differ.

A pantheistic identity cannot take on the character of a revealed Creator, nor can the im-

personal Tao be equal to the Buddha's agnosticism, Nirvanic annihilation, Hindu disillusion ("oneness" with the cosmos), Taoist progressive enlightenment and eternal salvation through a personal savior incarnated once in space and time blatantly disagree. Renouncing the illusion of Maya is not embracing and serving a loving Savior.

Having experienced heightened psychic/mystical phenomenon through meditation, Maharaj could not eliminate the moral guilt (unresolved in Hinduism) which separated him from God.

He affirmed that man's spiritual predicament was not caused by metaphysical ignorance — elevated through climbing the endless spiritual ladder — but by moral estrangement from a holy and all-knowing God which can only be reconciled through Christ's work on the cross for the forgiveness of sins.

The challenge he raised is important: when inspecting spiritual realities, will one merely subsume all religious experience under the amorphous title of universal mysticism, or will he look at the content that explains the various experiences.

The content and experience of Jesus Christ has led Rabi Maharaj from far-off India to the U.S. and Europe to speak of his personal liberation. Christ's claims cannot

be convoluted into merely one of many; he claimed unique liberating power as the only Son of God. These claims deserve honest investigation.

Douglas Groothuis
Junior, Philosophy

Petition for Whales

Oregonians Cooperating To Protect the Whales are now working to prevent the continuing slaughter of whales. We are going to tell the whaling nations our concern that a small number of their citizens are killing these intelligent extra-terrestrial beings.

Help us gather signatures on our initiative petition which will put a measure on the ballot on November 7. This measure, when passed by the voters of Oregon, will prohibit Oregon state and local governments from purchasing products from nations that whale for profit. We feel that this is the most effective way for the people in our state to communicate our concern to the people in foreign whaling nations.

Please stop in at our office on the mall or call us (485-5144) for more information or to help.

Harry Epstein
for Oregonians Cooperating to
Protect Whales,
873 Willamette, Eugene.

opinion

Redden is wrong

Submitted by S. Lynn Parkinson
Attorney at Law, Oregon City

This letter is in response to articles concerning the opinion of Attorney General Jim Redden that the decision by the Board of Higher Education to divest itself of holdings in corporations doing business in South Africa has no force. In my opinion, Redden's opinion is wrong, morally and legally, and in contradiction to an opinion issued by the Attorney General two years ago. Both opinions were in fact authored in large part by Ed Branchfield.

First, it should be clear what the role of American corporations in South Africa is. In the April 24, 1978, "Christian Science Monitor" reporter June Goodwin wrote of continuing black protest in Port Elizabeth (the "Detroit" of South Africa — the fifth largest city and center of the auto industry). Goodwin stated that security police warned the heads of the Ford and General Motors plants, "not to employ relatives of blacks who have been detained or whom the police deem activists." She reported that the auto executives agreed to this. She also reported that 1,400 persons were being held without charges or trial in Port Elizabeth. The "liberalizing" benefit of American corporations, argued by the opponents of divestiture is clearly a sham. Just as clearly, Ford and General Motors are directly involved in the institutionalization of racism and fascism in Port Elizabeth, South Africa.

Returning to Oregon, two years ago the Attorney General issued an opinion in which it was stated, correctly, that investments of University endowment funds were to be administered by the Oregon Investment Council as to day-to-day "buy-sell decisions" and that "policy decisions" must be made, according to statute, by the Board of Higher Education. That opinion described the Investment Council as the "sub-agent" of the Board of Higher Education. Now the Attorney General apparently believes that the Board has no policy making function, that the Council is not its sub-agent, and that the Board has no power to control the investment of its funds.

I and others had an opportunity to question Redden and Branchfield about this apparent contradiction just prior to the release of the latest opinion. When pressed as to why in 1976 the Board of Higher Education had authority to make policy decisions but in 1978 it did not, the only answer was that in 1976 they had no idea that the Board would make this particular policy decision. The apparent rule of law is that the Board has authority to make policy decisions as long as those decisions do not offend the Attorney General — or Ed Branchfield. It should be noted that Branchfield has ably served the interests of trans-national corporations in Salem through both Democratic and Republican office holders, changing his political loyalties as well as his legal opinions to meet the needs of the moment.

Finally, we should all be aware that the Attorney General's opinion is just an opinion. The fight to pull the money of Higher Education in Oregon out of businesses which cooperate with and promote South African racism and fascism is not over. Those among us who hold justice dearer than the short term interests of Ford and General Motors need to do all in our power to see the Attorney General's opinion does not stand.

