



your turn

ROTC and homosexuality

On May 4, 1983 faculty members of the University will be asked to vote on Prof. Cheyney Ryan's motion dealing with three issues concerning Reserve Officer's Training Corps: scholarships, the upper division program, and faculty appointments. Prof. Ryan's concern relates to a Department of Defense's policy that precludes homosexuals from serving in the armed forces.

A number of people have asked me to explain my role in the management of ROTC as this does have a bearing on the issue. I do two things: As a University department head, I manage an educational program; as a lieutenant colonel and representative of the executive branch of government, I manage the process by which second lieutenants are commissioned in the Army. The education program conforms to University policies, the commissioning process conforms to Department of Defense policies.

ROTC scholarships are part of the commissioning process. Scholarships are awarded by the Army Training and Doctrine Command, not by the Department of Military Science at this University. The recipients can use their scholarships at any university with a ROTC program. As an army officer, I provide information and assistance to applicants. I do

encourage University students to apply for the scholarships and to use them here.

ROTC upper division classes, like our lower division classes, are part of the University's educational program and, as such, are open to all students. For those who desire a commission, the route through the process includes the completion of lower and upper division military science classes, a physical examination and contracting prior to the start of upper division courses.

ROTC faculty appointments conform to all University policies. When an officer is nominated for an appointment, sexual preference is not an issue. The nomination, along with the officer's vita, three letters of recommendation, and a personal statement are submitted to the University's faculty ROTC Advisory Committee. The committee recommends

acceptance or rejection to the President.

The Department of Defense policy is clear. The commissioning process, which in effect is offering the opportunity of post graduation employment, conforms to that policy. I think the policy's implementation bears upon the issue. Sexual preference is not asked nor sought during the process. If the information is volunteered, I would, if appropriate, advise the individual of the ramifications.

You must decide for yourselves if the University and its students are well served by the opportunities afforded by ROTC. There is no question that Oregon graduates have served the army and their country well.

I look forward to seeing you at the May 4 assembly.

Steven Wolfram

Wolfram is head of the military science department and a lieutenant colonel in the U.S. army.

letters

Comparison

The homosexual activist lobby is distorting their cause by comparing their efforts to those of the civil rights campaign of the early 70s. Their cause doesn't even come close in characteristics to

those racial minorities.

For one thing, homosexual practices aren't a factor determined by genetics. One is not born homosexual in the same way we are born either male or female or black or white. It's their choice to practice such a lifestyle.

letters

Dissenting

Dissenting from conventional wisdom is a lonely experience. Questioning the initiative designating the University as a nuclear-free zone will not intimidate me.

This initiative establishes the University "as a Nuclear-Free Zone wherein the design, testing, production, deployment, and use of nuclear weapons is prohibited. Any other research supporting the development of nuclear weapons is also prohibited. The University of Oregon hereby denounces the use or threatened use of nuclear weapons as a defense..."

Students For a Nuclear Free Future petitioned the initiative on the ballot. It passed by a 3,283 to 885 vote.

I voted against this initiative because I think it is vague and foolhardy. For example, how is this going to affect the nuclear physics courses in the physics department? Who will have the authority to determine what constitutes research on nuclear weapons? How will this authority enforce this initiative? In short, won't this initiative abridge academic freedom?

Secondly, I contend the United States is within its right to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons as a defense. I think our nation's sovereignty is imperiled if we renounce this right. I fear that without a modern nuclear force we will have to build an even bigger conventional army. Conscripted young men is much more likely. How else would we defend ourselves?

I don't think this is a very practical alternative, but I think it can happen. As long as the Kremlin wants to takeover the world and the West resists, there is an inherent threat of nuclear war. We must accept this fact or we invite International Socialism, world government.

World government — that's what fascism is pretty much about. We must live free or die.

David Herman
senior, telecommunications

Python's point

Concerning Debbi Roberts' obtuse review of Monty Python's "The Meaning of Life:" I wonder if Roberts failed to perceive the very essence of the idiomatic logic of the Python's humor which is rooted in their Oxbridge studies of Kant and Kierkegaard.

Monty Python is not just a silly comic amusement, but a touchstone of Western culture — this is serious stuff. Perhaps Roberts should ask herself if her repulsed reaction was in any way part of the Python's intention. What Roberts was witnessing in "The Meaning of Life" was a satirical wit called "sarcasm" which depends upon having shock value on its target.

In other words, Roberts, the reason you were so repulsed by this film is because you were the target; you were the Python's intended victim. Anyone who sees Python films as all embracing hedonism is missing the point; their films are actually moral lessons.

The film's title offers as clue; "what is the meaning of life?" is the most basic philosophical question; a paradox of the ethical vs. the logical. It is the Pythonian view that over moral issues, no question of intellectual foundation can properly arise — hence the anarchistic breakdown of plot — they get silly.

But this reflects not only the preoccupation of the Pythons, but of ourselves. What philosophical problems do we already have in mind before we see a Python film? What is acceptable and what is not? Are they being sexist or are they exposing this human vice by holding it up to ridicule?

What are the moral issues behind organ transplants and over-consumption (the man puking in the restaurant)?

The Pythons use a sort of flippant objective correlative to get their points across, and to this, a corollary to Santayana's famous adage: those who are ignorant of the context of ideas are destined to misunderstand them.

Ralph McDaniel
senior, architecture

El Salvador

I would like to ask Ronald Reagan this: If he truly believes that we should not protect a government from, "the anger of its own people," how can he in good conscience support the government of El Salvador?

We have just over 30 days to respond to Pres. Reagan. One sentence is all it takes to let your representatives know how you feel about sending \$110 million in military aid to El Salvador.

A stamped postcard costs 13 cents. And there is a list of state officials and their addresses on the bulletin board at the University Station post office.

Please take the time to write. If we stand up, we will be heard.

Robin Kelley
Tuesday, May 3, 1983

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
Display Advertising and Business
Classified Advertising
Production
Circulation

555-5511
555-3712
555-4343
555-4381
555-5511

Editor
Managing Editor
News Editor
Assistant News Editor
Editorial Page Editor
Photo Editor
Sports Editor
Associate Sports Editor
Entertainment Editor
Night Editor
Associate Editors
Higher Education
Departments and Schools
Student Government
Features
Politics
Student Services/Community Affairs
General Staff
Advertising Manager
Classified Advertising
Production Manager
Controller

Harry Esteve
John Healy
Marian Green
Cort Fernald
Joan Nyland
Bob Baker
Mike Riplinger
Paul Danzer
Jonathan Siegle
Debbie Howlett
Sandy Johnstone
Frank Shaw
Richard Burr
Sean Meyers
Michele Matassa
Aleta Zak
Darlene Gore
Sally Ojjar
Victoria Koch
Jean Ownbey

Why is someone any more entitled to special civil rights protection for practicing a deviant lifestyle such as homosexuality any more than someone who has a preference for animals (beastiality)? Both are considered immoral by the majority of people. I see little difference between the two preferences in degree of abnormality, yet the same rhetoric employed to rationalize one (homosexuality) could easily be used to justify the other (beastiality).

Many groups would like society to accept (and even approve) every practice and not judge anything as wrong. But just how desirable would such a society with no moral standards (amoral) be to live in — much less bring your children up in?

Edward White
sophomore, chemistry