

IFC needs to respect church-state limits

The IFC decided not to fund groups promoting religious points of view, but it's having trouble deciding the difference between religion and culture.

ASUO Pres. Dave Eaton should help the committee clarify the distinction to insure the separation of church and state. Clearly, student money shouldn't be used to fund religious groups.

It's clear to us that the Campus Crusade for Christ and the Latter Day Saints Student Union are both religious organizations. Yet the IFC approved the goals of the Mormons and denied the goals of the CCC.

Considering the circumstances, maybe we should pray the IFC nails down some consistency before budget hearings begin.

IFC chairer Jon Neiderbach lamely argues the difference between the two groups is that the CCC

tries to convert students while the Mormons promote social activities and explain Mormon culture to students.

But there isn't a religious group in the world that can't claim at least some historical uniqueness, and as long as their primary reason for

We also question the propriety of IFC member Susan Harris casting the deciding vote in the 4-3 decision to accept the Mormon's goals. Her husband Dan is the director of the LDSSU.

Harris should have voluntarily removed herself from the voting.

Now it's up to Eaton to correct this glaring inconsistency in IFC policy.

His veto should be immediate, and should not depend on consultation with leaders of the Campus Interfaith Ministry. Unfortunately, Eaton has shown an unusual lack of resolve in the matter.

Eaton should waste no time in getting the IFC back on the right track, and the committee should re-read its policy on funding of religious groups.

And then perhaps the mistake can be forgiven.

OURS

existence is religion they shouldn't be funded.

If the IFC funds the Mormons, every conceivable religious group in the cosmos of Eugene will claim a unique culture and the need for student dollars.

None of them should be funded.

YOURS

Prophecies

In response to Susan Plass and her critique of the prophecy in Ezekiel 38 and 39, one must grant that she has discovered the greatest apparent inconsistency between Ezekiel's vision and modern warfare. That a modern army should be equipped with shields and bucklers does seem unlikely. One possible explanation is that the vision is symbolic, as is much of the imagery in the Bible. The vision was revealed in a form comprehensible to a man of his day. On the matter of the burning of the weapons, note that the BMP, the standard Soviet personnel carrier, has magnesium armor, which is combustible. Perhaps the magnesium will be used as a fuel to melt down the other weapons in a gigantic salvage operation.

Ezekiel 38, verses 2-6, identifies the enemy of Israel as Magog, leading the hostile forces, which include Persia, Ethiopia and Libya, along with Gomer and the house of Togarmah. Turning to William Smith's "Bible Dictionary" one finds Magog defined as "...representing the Scythians, in the sense of the general tribes north of the Caucasus." Gog is called the chief prince of Meschech and Tubal, identified by Smith as Armenia and Georgia, respectively. Sounds like Russia, doesn't it? Taking Persia, Ethiopia and Libya at face value (and assuming that Iran will gravitate toward the Soviet sphere in time) we see the outline of the Soviet coalition. Smith equates Gomer with the Cimmerians, a people of the Eurasian steppes, in what is now the

USSR. Togarmah refers again to Armenia, and this repeated reference to that area may indicate the route of the invading army from the north.

In verse 8, it says that the invaders shall "...come into the land that is brought back from the sword, and is gathered out of many people, against the mountains of Israel, which have always been waste..." This verse does not refer to the Egyptian nor Babylonian captivity, because Israel is gathered out of many nations. The reference is to the Roman captivity, which is ending in our time.

Verse 13 names other nations supporting the invaders. Sheba refers to the kingdom of that name, which was located in the area of what is now Yemen. Dedan is identified on one old Biblical map I have seen as an area in northern Saudi Arabia. The merchants of Tarshish were the traders of metals in the ancient eastern Mediterranean. This may refer either to their main trading city, Tyre (now a center of PLO. strength) or to their modern counterparts, the merchants of petroleum (Iraq, Kuwait, Bahrain et al) or both. In Ezekiel 39, verse 18, the fallen invaders are described as "fallings of Bashan." Bashan refers to the land to the east of the river Jordan, including northern Jordan and part of Syria.

The list is complete. The enemies of Israel include the Soviet Union, Iran, Ethiopia, Libya (possibly with African allies) the PLO, Yemen, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Syria, Iraq, Kuwait, and the Arab Gulf sheikdoms. They will attack Israel and be destroyed. Note that Egypt is not listed among the enemies of Israel.

These two nations will apparently be at peace with one another. The prophecy bears a striking resemblance to the present geopolitical situation, and suggests the eventual outcome of the struggle between Iraq and Iran will place both nations on the side of the Soviet Union in the war against Israel.

Steve Hanselman
Graduate, History

Bad reactions

In reading student reactions to the freeing of the American hostages I was rather sickened by the hypocrisy shown by American students who wished to see the hostages tried and "punished."

If some of the hostages were spying on Iranian affairs (a sad thing, but a practice of every country) then it is not for us to hold them up as scapegoats for their employer — the United States government, i.e. you and I.

I seriously doubt if any student on this campus could provide proof of covert activity against Iran committed by the hostages. However, if these Americans so strongly object to covert activity by the U.S. government I would suggest they work to change these policies (or cease to support them by renouncing their U.S. citizenship) instead of casually suggesting that those Americans whom they will never know or come in contact with take the blame for years of practices that all Americans are guilty of.

It seems to me that the students quoted in the Emerald Tuesday find it easy to point a finger at a scapegoat over an issue they know little of. This is an issue

that all Americans must stand up for, not simply 52 bystanders.

I doubt the students would cry "trial" or take up the cause if there were any personal sacrifice involved.

Kimberly Insley
Sophomore, pre-journalism

From Stupid

This letter is from the old bum, Stupid himself, regarding the article (Monday) in the Emerald.

I feel that, due to the ignorance of the reporter, I have been publicly insulted. The reputation of Stupid has "been dragged in the dust," and a public apology should be the next point on the agenda!

Call me an old tramp, a bum, or whatever pleases you (let your conscience be your guide) and I will answer it with a smile. But refer to me as a "political character" and the smile leaves, to be replaced with a permanent frown, until appropriate public apology brings the smile back!

I have no quarrel with the rest of the article.

The road to damnation, I'm sure, is paved with good intentions. Yours for honest reporting,

Stupid

Veterans reply

In response to Tuesday's Emerald article on Ron Phillips standing on the American flag while reading anti-war poetry we want it to be clear that this was done as an individual action by Mr. Phillips and that he did not represent University Veterans.

While we understand the feelings of Mr. Phillips which led to such action we have to note that all that was accomplished was the alienation of those we are trying to reach.

We regret that the Emerald chose not to make it clear this was an individual action and hope that in the future it will try to do responsible and accurate reporting.

David Isenberg
Acting director, University Veterans

letters policy

The Emerald will accept and try to print all letters containing fair comment on ideas and topics or interest to the University community. Letters must be typewritten, using 65-character margins and should be triple spaced.

Letters must be signed, the author's field of study (or faculty status) noted and should include address and phone number where possible.

