

opinion

Qualified support for quality control

Chancellor Bud Davis should retain the increased grade point average and continue promoting the proposed admission prerequisites regardless of pressure from high school boards.

Reconsidering the raising of grading standards from 2.5 to 2.75 is not in the best interest of the students in the long run.

The increased GPA might help ease the attrition rate of the freshman at the University. It might increase the level of learning that goes on here, weeding out those who are not serious about their education. It might discipline college-bound students.

It might not.

Universities weren't established to prepare students for the university life.

The state board is stressing the "university" as the highest place of education in the state — state colleges and community colleges are to be the places of preparatory, trade and technical education.

The board campaigns to improve the image of the universities — ours, Oregon State, and Portland State. One way to improve the image is to show how tough the requirements to enter these institutions are.

But, and this is a large doubt, these new requirements might be slitting our throats in the short run.

Any decrease in students means less funding. A new base of funding, dependent on function not enrollment, needs to be proposed, before we limit any more students — lifeblood — from the universities.

Unless, of course, the state raises tuition to compensate for the loss of full-time equivalency hours — a horrible, unviable proposition.

The state board needs to consider those "frozen out" by the new proposals. Community colleges and state colleges must be able to "meet the needs" of these students with the necessary university preparatory classes. They require time to do this.

School districts, as voiced by Joyce Benjamin of the state department of education, need more time to implement the new college-prep requirements. Serious consideration should be given to Benjamin's reconsideration of a 1986 requirement deadline versus Davis' 1985.

There exists a limit to the amount of "quality control" the board can consider without ironically hurting the universities in the interim.



your turn

civil defense won't work

On Nov. 15 the Emerald printed an article by David Steinmetz entitled "Civil Defense: Basic relocation plan is in the works but poor planning and facilities could force most people to beat a hasty retreat." Implied in the title and in the article is the idea that the United States should spend more money on civil defense in order to provide protection in the event of a nuclear war.

I contend that to do so is not only a waste of money, but it also threatens the security of the United States.

In the event of all out nuclear war there is no survival anywhere. Civil defense will not work. Even if you escape the initial blasts, firestorms, and fallout; the ozone won't.

It is estimated that 70 percent to 80 percent of the ozone in the northern hemisphere and 30 percent to 40 percent of the ozone in the southern hemisphere will be destroyed. These

figures assume that all of the nuclear blasts will take place in the northern hemisphere.

With this level of ozone depletion enough ultraviolet radiation would penetrate the earth's atmosphere to blind any unprotected eyes. We can all wear glasses, but the animals can't. Our eco-system would be destroyed and any survival would be temporary at best.

Developing plans for civil defense thus indicates a belief in fighting and surviving a limited nuclear war. Such a belief implies that a limited nuclear war of any kind is winnable. It is not.

There is no way any country can win a nuclear war. In fact, the only hope for limiting a nuclear war is that at the sight of the horrible death and destruction, both countries agree to stop and to disarm.

There is no precedent to such an end to war. The short time span of a nuclear war makes this scenario very unlikely. In any event, a civil defense plan must not be in effect or the death, destruction and suffering would not be witnessed and the war would simply escalate.

A limited nuclear war is a contradiction in terms as any nuclear war will eventually escalate to holocaust proportions.

As Admiral Noel Gayler explained in an interview with Common Cause, "The reason I don't think there could be a limited nuclear war is because any nuclear initiative will have a reply. And the reply will be bigger than the initiative."

"That's the way doctrine is on both sides, and that's the way people are. And so it's only a question of how many steps up the ladder of escalation before you have the total holocaust."

Any belief in or talk about a limited nuclear war is extremely dangerous as it creates an illusion that could lead to a nuclear strike and ultimately to the death of humanity. It is time to dispel the illusion that we can have and can win a limited nuclear war.

Civil defense plans contribute to that illusion. The only defense is prevention.

H. Jack Geiger, M.D. says, "There is no defense; civil defense is at best an illusion, at worst a fraud."

Steinmetz's article accurately reports that the Soviets are outspending us in the area of civil defense. The article implies that we should follow their example so that we do not fall too far behind in civil defense capabilities. The Soviets are wasting their money and we don't need to waste ours too.

Admiral Gayler contends, "If you go to competent, intelligent Soviet sources, you find out that while they spend a lot of money on civil defense, it's pretty much a sham, just like it is here. They, too, have been the victims of wishful thinking. It's a turkey, and there's no reason why we should copy it."

In this age of economic recession and tight government spending it is ridiculous to spend \$154 million a year on civil defense.

There are many programs that are in desperate need of money — student loans, for example. Let's spend our time and energy on solution to the nuclear arms race; not on solutions to what you would do in the event of a nuclear war, because, in that event, it is all over.

Bill Hallmark
sophomore, psychology

letters

Sports fans

Being an avid sports fan I am appalled at the lack of coverage and disregard the Emerald has for sports.

The Emerald did give some space to the National Football League strike, however, anxiously tearing through Monday's paper I found no scores after being "football-less" for eight weeks. The season is laughable, so I can live with that slight, but GEEZ the Blazers (Remember them? They are the National Basketball Association team up in Portland.) set a franchise record for margin of victory (50 points) and the Emerald doesn't even carry a paragraph. Hell I'd settle for a boxscore!

Since the Emerald is a member of the Associated Press that's not too terribly much to ask, is it? Imagine my horror the next morning upon hearing the Blazers won in Philadelphia for the first time since 1977 and again the Emerald's only response seems to be, "Sorry sports fans."

If national sports stories are too tough to handle how about just a blurb on the intramural championships being played

this week on campus? I need a sports fix and the Emerald just doesn't do it. C'mon Emerald writers — shape up!

Tim McCloskey

Upsurge

Many are outraged (we must be many) by the recent upsurge of right-wing "christian" speakers at the EMU. I am frightened by their view of me as their enemy. I don't want to be anyone's enemy.

I am not a christian. That is my right. I don't buy into their hell and damnation theory — on a rational level, on a spiritual level, on a human level.

As these speakers draw the lines, who are their victims? Are they women, blacks, homosexuals, Jews, or everyone? As I respect their right to preach, I also respect our right to live in freedom, in equality, in peace with ourselves and our peers.

I am frightened by the hints of fascism in their messages. Where is the root of their evil? Is it me? or does it lie in the denial of their humanity in the service of "their God?"

I am frightened by their tactics. Their lack of reason, their

lack of compassion, the stench of hate surrounding them. Their quick readiness to deny us our individuality, our equality, our rights as Americans.

But mostly I am frightened by our reaction. Of silence, of apathy, of smiles and nods, of laughter.

Fascism is not funny. Denial of human rights and human dignity is not funny. It is tragic. It is not in the interests of the America I know and love, and of our people, whom I love as well.

David Funk
asst. director
Gay and Lesbian Alliance

oregon daily emerald

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published Monday through Friday except during exam week and vacations, by the Oregon Daily Emerald Publishing Co., at the University of Oregon, Eugene, OR, 97403.

The Emerald operates independently of the University with offices on the third floor of the Erb Memorial Union and is a member of the Associated Press.

| | |
|----------------------------------|----------|
| News and Editorial | 686-5511 |
| Display Advertising and Business | 686-3712 |
| Classified Advertising | 686-4343 |
| Production | 686-4381 |
| Circulation | 686-5511 |

Editor: Harry Esteve

| | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Managing Editor | John Healy |
| News Editor | Marian Green |
| Assistant News Editor | Cort Fernald |
| Editorial Page Editor | Joan Nyland |
| Photo Editor | Bob Baker |
| Sports Editor | Mike Ripinger |
| Associate Sports Editor | Paul Danzer |
| Entertainment Editor | Jonathan Siegle |
| Night Editor | Cort Fernald |
| Associate Editors | |
| Higher Education | Debbie Howlett |
| Departments and Schools | Sandy Johnstone |
| Student Government | Richard Burr |
| Features | Sean Meyers |
| Politics | Michele Matassa |
| Community | David Brown |
| General Staff | |
| Advertising Manager | Darlene Gore |
| Classified Advertising | Sally Oljar |
| Production Manager | Victoria Koch |
| Controller | Jean Ownbey |