

HEW realistically interprets Title IX

The federal government made a sensible decision this week regarding women's sports and the impact that Title IX legislation will have on them. By setting guidelines insuring that men and women athletes will receive an equal proportion of scholarships, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare will allow universities to maintain their men's football and basketball programs at a competitive level.

OURS

This most recent interpretation of Title IX, an anti-discrimination statute instituted in 1972, will eliminate the per capita spending requirement in areas including publicity, game scheduling, equipment, practice sessions, travel allowances, availability of coaching, medical and training services, and such facilities as locker rooms.

Though this interpretation will mean that

men's athletics will continue to receive more funding than the women's, the ruling serves the best interest of all athletic programs. Absolute parity would be a financial disaster for all concerned. Why is this the case?

The University's Athletic Department budget is dependent on revenues that men's football and basketball teams generate. Football is far and away the most lucrative program, generating well over half of the Athletic Department's entire budget. The catch is that it is also the most expensive, in terms of equipment, personnel and recruiting.

These expenses are worth the investment because of the capital return that large football crowds provide. Many of the men's programs and all of the women's depend on these gate receipts.

However, these financial realities should not blur the original intent of Title IX — elevating women's sports to a competitive level. We strongly support this concept and urge the Athletic

Department to continue publicizing women's sports on a serious basis.

Women's teams can draw spectators. This week's game against the Russians is evidence of this. However, progress takes time and money. Because HEW ruled against across-the-board parity, money will continue to be available from the Athletic Department.

We encourage the administration, along with the Athletic Department, to continue boosting women's athletics. We also urge all University students — men and women — to support our women's teams by attending their games.

The federal government took a giant-step toward equality in athletics in 1972 by instituting Title IX. And HEW has now clarified these regulations in a practical manner, so that compliance with them will be financially possible. The next step forward must be taken by the Athletic Department. The ball is in their court now.

YOURS

No room for waste

Just before Thanksgiving, Glenn Boettcher noted a number of predictions in his column "Fire and Rain." Pacific Power and Light, Portland General Electric and the Department of Energy are in the business of meeting our energy needs, and understandably, all enter into the guessing game. No one has the crystal ball. So they read each other's figures. What develops is an accepted ballpark of expectations where one game is played: big energy. It is the assumption underlying these "calculations" of demand which I question.

First, we're dealing here in energy of one variety — electric. Electricity is expensive to make. If you accept the notion of energy as twice removed from the source, then the inefficiency is clear. Whether you make it by tearing down coal ridges, by risking another oil rig or by raising nuclear stacks, you've got middlemen. The first is heat to drive turbines — energy lost. Then comes miles of high-tension wires from plant to end use, and reconversion — energy lost. Electricity is inefficient, hence expensive in its demands on the environment and the budget.

If it's going to cost big dollars to get

electricity, the first question we must ask is how much energy we need in the form of electricity and only electricity, while we're paying a premium price. The answer is almost shocking. We already have too much. Today, while only 8 percent of our requirements are exclusively electric in nature, such as home stereo and industrial fabrication, etc., we're making (and burning) enough to constitute 13 percent of our total usage. What is going on? Essentially it is a question of misuse.

Over one third of the power we produce in centralized plants is being used inefficiently, used to perform functions which could be done as well with other kinds of energy and at a lower cost. The big culprits in the misappropriation are space heating and air conditioning. Until now, there seemed little reason to demand precision in choosing the proper energy sources for every need. We must move from the age of convenience to the age of efficiency; we must be careful with fire.

Efficiency: If you don't heat the house with electricity, your refrigerator is probably the largest contributor to your monthly statement. The current designs emphasize appearance and economy for the manufacturer alone. The cost to you is an energy usage six times what is

necessary to do the job. We can't afford this any more than the astronomical cost of nuclear plants. Insulation can make your house (in Eugene's climate) tight to the point that lights and bodies will keep you comfortable. No heating bill — efficiency.

Those who bring us electricity are worried. The alternatives they face are all unpleasant, but only assuming that we need to make a whole lot more electricity fast. There is no reason to do so. The costs are too high to the economy, to the consumer and to the landscape — even if we hadn't thought of solar.

It is very important that we, as users, respond to energy producers by taking every possible step toward personal energy efficiency. It is equally important that we inform them of our view as consumers interested in a sensible moderation of electricity. Enclose some thoughts with your next check to EWEB. Who would want to pay the price of a nuclear plant that is unnecessary?

Christian Knoeller

Rights violations

I had intended to reply to Mr. Dimarco's letter of Oct. 26th, but did not find time to do so. Therefore, I am delighted

that he has decided to continue his argument (Dec 3rd).

I have been involved with the protest of Chile's military dictatorship for several years, and I frequently hear the remark "Why not protest the Soviet Union?". Generally this remark is not uttered because the speaker truly cares about human rights in the Soviet Union, but only as a red herring — an excuse for not doing anything about human rights anywhere. Yes, Mr. DiMarco, if you are in this category, you are the hypocrite.

To answer the question "why Chile?": The U.S. government actively worked to overthrow a democratically elected government in Chile. As a result, a military dictatorship now rules Chile, and 40,000 Chileans are dead, one million Chileans are living in exile and 2500 Chileans have disappeared. Another result of the U.S. intervention in Chile is that Chile now has a good "investment climate" for U.S. corporations. Orlando Letelier pointed out that the brutal suppression of human rights in Chile and the terrorism maintained by the Pinochet regime are directly connected to the economic program Pinochet has imposed on Chile. In order to attract foreign investment, the Chilean military dictatorship wants to assure corporations of a submissive and cheap labor force. Letelier was assassinated in Washington, D.C. in 1976.

A U.S. grand jury investigation implicated Chilean military officials in this assassination. This fall the Chilean courts refused to allow these officials to be extradited. Last week the U.S. government announced diplomatic and economic efforts in order "to make clear to the Chilean government that such acts of terrorism cannot be tolerated." Unfortunately, the measures announced by our government amount to only a diplomatic slap on the wrist. For example, our government announced that the Export-Import Bank will not make loans to Chile. However, the Export-Import Bank has not loaned to Chile since 1976. It is universally agreed that the one most effective measure that the U.S. could take is the termination of U.S. private bank loans to Chile. Pres. Carter has been urged to take this step by Congressional representatives, labor organizations and others. However, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and U.S. corporations oppose this step. It appears that rather than supporting the struggle for human rights in Chile, our government is instead supporting corporations quest for profits. The U.S. professes to support justice, freedom and democracy. As a U.S. citizen, when I protest U.S. support for the military dictatorship in Chile, I am working to make my government act upon its ideals rather than make a travesty of them.

G. Studd

Friday, December 7, 1979

theirs

