

Stops further cuts

As this school draws to a close, it is time to look toward next year. Next year the University, along with all of the other schools in the state system, will have its budget cut at least 10 percent. At the University, there will be fewer professors, fewer classes offered, fewer student services and the odds are there will be fewer departments as well.

Higher education in the state of Oregon will suffer dramatically in the next few years. The University is definitely in financial trouble, and we, the students, are going to suffer the most. We not only will receive a lower quality education, but we will pay more for it. There is no doubt we will pay at least \$400 and probably closer to \$500 per term for in-state tuition.

On Thursday May 28 all of the schools in the state system are sending students to the capitol to lobby for higher education. I would like to urge every student who possibly can to attend. We cannot stop cuts from being made, but we can show the legislators how important it is for these cuts not to go beyond 10 percent. The only way to convince the legislators that students really do care is to attend this rally or at least write to your legislator. The people in Salem need to hear our input.

Chuck Pflieger
ASUO legislative resource coordinator

MXing it up

I read a letter the other day that was discussing the MX missile. The writer claimed that the United States already had the capability to intercept incoming Soviet missiles. This is a dangerous misconception many people may have.

In the event of a Soviet ICBM strike against the United States we have no capability whatsoever to intercept incoming missiles. The only system that could accomplish this (theoretically) is the ABM (anti-ballistic missile) which was banned by the SALT I treaty. It was scrapped because of its impracticality and the destabilizing effect it would have on U.S.-USSR mutual deterrence. So we have nothing which can physically defend us from nuclear attack. Therefore, the present strategic policy of the US is based on "deterrence," not "defense" (although the defense myth is still perpetuated).

The proposed MX system is another destabilizing influence on the deadly nuclear balance. The MX missile is a weapon designed to have first strike capabilities against "hard" targets (con-



crete missile silos). The Soviets knowing this will be forced to consider a couple options.

One is a pre-emptive massive first strike before the MX system is in place. Another is to adopt a launch-on-warning posture. This means that if they detect any incoming missiles (or their instruments malfunction and indicate an attack) then they will launch everything they've got so they can clear their silos before our warheads hit. It seems the net effect of the MX system will be only to increase cold war tensions and make Soviet reactions increasingly less predictable.

One further development to watch for will be the possibility of a change in the proposed basing mode of the MX. The people in Nevada and Utah are not exactly welcoming the MX with open arms and in fact the Mormon church just recently spoke out against it. Enter SUM (small-sub undersea missile) which is a plan to deploy the MX in diesel-electric submarines off the U.S. continental shelf. This will certainly take the heat off of the military from the people concerned with the impact of a land based system, yet the aforementioned destabilization will still occur. "In the sea, out of mind" may be the military's next tactic.

Anyone interested in the survivability of humans rather than the survivability of weapons systems should be wary of

subjective interpretations of the arms race by government and military sources. Some rather disconcerting facts are tucked away in government documents, military journals, and scientific papers.

John Rygh
Senior, geology

I prefer not to associate myself with any large group. To express a point of view on any issue of relative importance in a letter to the editor, then, would be hypocritical.

Mark Nitzberg
Junior, undeclared

Not culture

The South Korean version of the American rock band, East Asians dancing to Western music and Americans doing the belly dance, left one bewildered as to whether the May 10 event was an international cultural night or a miscellaneous entertainment night. Although there was some authenticity to some presentations, the program as a whole was undoubtedly permeated by a confused and erroneous understanding of culture.

Culture, as we have come to understand it, is a manifestation of the social, political and economical relationships of the majority of the people in a country. Naturally, the social conditions of a nation are reflected in its culture in the form of folk tales, songs and dances as well as in its plays, poetry, arts, etc., provided that they are genuinely authentic.

Bearing this definition of culture in mind, it could be concluded that the international night failed in its attempt of being a cultural evening.

Although we acknowledge the efforts of those who worked hard to put this program together, especially the FSO director, Julie Mungai, we feel that there was a definite lack of direction and hardly any clear-cut guidelines which led to a Westernized and stereotypical presentation of various cultures and limited these presentations to singing and dancing.

We hope that in the coming years the student organizations and other participants will keep these points in mind and be true representatives of the cultures, so that the audience can leave with a little more than a mind well-entertained and a belly full of "mesmerizing international cuisine"!

B. Zandi
Iranian Students Association

Guest editorial

'Safety net' will trap disadvantaged

By Chester Faller II

Director, Physically Limited Union of Students

Political analysts agree, the social pendulum is swinging to the right and liberals are scattering to get out of the way. The disabled, being the last to gain their civil rights, are now strapped to the leading edge of that pendulum. I could spend the rest of this editorial describing, specifically, the erosion of civil rights for the disabled, except civil rights for everyone are eroding.

Pres. Reagan is not heartless to those who are disadvantaged "through no fault of their own" and offers these people a "safety net." But to me nets are made to catch and hold things down. As far as I know that will be the effect of this "safety net."

The logic behind this administration's attitude is based on three assumptions. The first is the belief that affirmative action discriminates against non-minorities — for example, able-bodied white males (ABWM) — and that race, sex, creed, or disability should not be a factor. This assumption fails to take into account that discrimination in the past has retarded the development of minorities so that we are unable to compete equally with the ABWM.

It's like allowing us to race in a 100 meter dash nine seconds after the starter's pistol is shot. Without affirmative action you allow the effect of past discrimination to continue.

The second assumption is that in the United States social mobility is unrestricted — the Sen. Jesse Helm's (R-N.C.) "bootstraps" theory. But some of us cannot reach our feet, and others cannot afford boots. And to advance or survive in this society you need an education. Supposedly, segregation in public schools ended in 1954, but the Chicago school system is still segregated and the Los Angeles system just threw out their desegregation program!

In 1977, Section 504 allowed the disabled to participate in any public university degree program, but I still cannot major in journalism or join the Emerald staff. If you cannot get a job because of your education, how can you earn the money to pay for an education in order to get a job? It makes as much sense as the term "military intelligence." Cutting financial aid is counter-

productive.

The final assumption is that state and local governments can effectively enforce the civil rights statutes and fairly allocate the funds for equal opportunity programs. Bullshit! (There goes my academic analysis.) The problem in the first place was the racist, sexist and handicappist attitudes of local officials. Federal troops were needed in Little Rock, Ark.; Jackson, Miss.; and Montgomery, Ala. The so-called progressive state of California as well as most others kept segregated school systems for the disabled well into the mid '70s. Why do you think the Easter Seal schools were started? The foot dragging of local agencies in complying with Brown vs. Topeka Board of Education (1954), Section 504 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and Public Law 94-142 is evidence enough that rights of minorities are rarely served at home.

The "safety net" is being dropped on all minorities and the only one safe is the ABWM. When we separate ourselves as black, Chicanos, women and disabled, we become "interest groups." Combined, we become the oppressed masses. Individually, we cannot claw our way out, but together we can fight our way up.