# opinion

## ours

## ROTC arguments

When biology Prof. Bayard McConnaughey stands in the University Senate Wednesday to question the propriety of stationing a military training post at the University, several professors and probably a few students will protect themselves with psychological ear muffs.

Like weary commuters, they will sit stoically, not looking for (or seeing) anything new.

When the debate is over, having considered none of it, they will respond in a time-worn pattern: unenthusiastic approval of retaining the Reserve Officers Training Corps.

But some students and a few professors will be examining the ROTC issue for the first time. For them, and those who dare to challenge their own ideas, McConnaughey's presentation will be weighty and vivid. To the best of this group, the arguments will arouse the same sense of significance a 20-year-old experiences upon receiving a draft notice.

The University Senate's responsibility in this issue remains especially strong because the state of Oregon has designated the faculty and its representatives as the governing authority in academic policy.

Prof. McConnaughey has provided the faculty with a chance to exercise that responsibility by challenging the ROTC's University encampment. He has presented facts and arguments clearly, eloquently and compassionately. University senators must consider them in the same light.

They must consider whether one department should use University facilities and systems while owing allegiance to another, non-University authority that controls staff assignments and curriculum.

They must consider whether a University dedicated to scholarly investigation can accommodate one department dedicated to anti-intellectual purposes, particularly the training of persons who may one day be ordered to destroy others like them.

Perhaps more important, University senators must consider whether to endorse a military system that contributes to humanity's insecurity with every additional person it enlists and every additional dollar it accumulates.

Finally, they must decide either to perpetuate the pathological fear humanity has developed of itself, or to transcend that fear, a decision few of the world's citizens get the chance to contemplate.

Unless the senate bogs down in earlier agenda items, the body will consider McConnaughey's motion when it meets Wednesday at 3:30 p.m. in 150 Geology.

## Keep flags half-mast

Great religions and lunatics have always said the linkage between apparently unrelated events is too strong to be called coincidence.

We're starting to believe them.

Last week we would have liked to snarl and spit disdain for Richard Nixon's visit to the White House. We would have said he has no right to be there, that Carter had no right to invite him and that a great public uproar should send Nixon scurrying back to the safety of his San Clemente compound.

But we were tired.

Now we simply find joy in noting that Nixon's first return to 1600 Pennsylvania Ave. was marked with flags flown half-mast in honor of the death of a still-respected Republican.

We'd like to see them remain there until Nixon leaves.

## theirs

## The best efforts may lead to the worst predicament

By JOHN CUNNIFF
Associated Press Business Analyst

NEW YORK— Reviewing some of the government, economic and business announcements of late, you may conclude that the best efforts sometimes lead to the worst predicaments.

President Carter's announcement of a "lean and austere" budget for fiscal 1980, which begins Oct. 1, was instantly criticized as being like bacon: Open the package and you see the fat.

The President further erred in claiming his budget, which would spend $2,416.85 for every american, "is indeed fair to everyone in the nation." Millions, you may be sure, cannot be cajoled to that view.

He also left himself open to criticism from the budget-balance clique, who maintain that a $29 billion deficit at the crest of one of the longest expansion in the nation's history is inflationary.

But the budget is merely symbolic of intentions bending back to give the initiator a boomerang clout. The evidence is widespread.

Carter, for example, is said by some to be cornering himself into wage-price controls while seeking to avoid them. Fearing a clampdown, it is said, business is getting its price rises now rather than later.

The syndrome can be found everywhere.

Efforts to protect Americans through Social Security is, as many are discovering, liable to break them instead through payroll deductions.

Attempts of consumers to avoid higher future prices by buying now may be pushing up current and future prices, frustrating their very legitimate goal.

Tax accountants are said to be in confusion about last year's tax clarifications. Why, they ask, can a businessman deduct his costs for a clients's day at a hunting lodge, but not put him up overnight?

Don't puzzle over that too long, because the effort of all Americans are needed to resolve similar urgent questions and problems. Such as helping the Small Business Administration define "small business."

That agency has been around for years, and it has wrestled seriously with the definition. But it has had other problems too, and while it has made headway, "small business" in general remains a mystery.

What is said to be the most acceptable criteria presents questions of its own. It would be based on employment size— not gross receipts, sales or profits. "A bureaucrat's definition," say critics.

Meanwhile, we still try to define unemployment, and we busily correct the rest of last year's numbers. In spite of the commotion they created, those 1978 figures weren't accurate. They must be revised.

When do the efforts succeed? When do the contradictions cease? When are the promises fulfilled? When, finally, do the jobs get done?

greg wasson

## a quorum of one

Friendship being an important lobbying tool, the 1973 Legislature required lobbyists to file reports listing, in the words of Sen. George Winguard, R-Eugene, "how much friendship was being created each month."

The law requires a listing of any outlay more than $25 for entertainment of an individual Legislator or member of his or her staff.

Senate Bill 125, passed by the Senate last week and now property of the House, raises that trigger from $25 to $40 and allows quarterly, rather than monthly, expenditure reports during the legislative session.

The latter change was recommended by the Oregon Ethics Commission, the former by the Capitol's professional lobbying group, the Capitol Club.

Supporters of the increase argue it simply reflected the reality of the times. Everything, including influence, costs more these days.

That's a little strong.

The Oregon Legislature is basically an honest body, and votes are seldom for sale. But in the words of Sen. Jan Wyers, D-Portland, "We're not talking about bribery. What we are talking about is influence, and perhaps at times, undue influence."

Raising the individual declarations by $15 makes it easier to hide that influence. Twenty-five bucks still buys a nice meal and a bottle of wine, and the increase simply allows anonymous gifts to be more lavish.

Knowledge that gifts above $25 must be reported helps keep entertainment in check — a check the increase would erode. It could be embarrassing if voters know that their representatives party regularly off the graces of PGE or Georgia-Pacific.

Lobbying is a legitimate part of the democratic process, but it's nice to be able to find out whether legislative decisions are made in the office, because of strong presentations of facts and philosophies, or in the dim light of a Salem steak house.

Besides illustrating that most legislators are comfortable with the presence of professional lobbyists, debate over SB 125 displayed some members' contempt for public lobby groups.

Complaining about material that had been left on his desk, Sen. Keith Burbidge, D-Salem, wondered, "To the nods of others in the chamber, if it had been distributed by "Common Cause or Common Curse."