

opinion

Commission finds aid shifting from needy

This country's ideal of an egalitarian educational system has apparently been usurped by a "quiet, unintended shift of attention and funding" away from programs helping students from poor and lower-income families, according to a recent report issued by the National Commission on Student Financial Assistance.

In testimony heard by the House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, Kenneth Ryder, president of Northeastern University and member of the commission, said that unless this trend is checked the country will "drift into becoming a country where only the wealthy can be healthy and wise."

The commission was presenting their findings following a two-year study of student-aid issues. The study is needed for guidance by the House and Senate as they consider legislation to revise and extend student-aid programs before the Higher Education Act expires in Sept. 1985.

Ryder noted recent developments that have reduced federal support for the neediest students. And according to the commission, inflation has reduced the value of financial aid rewards to the neediest students, while subsidies to middle-income students have increased.

Ironically, the grants are designed to aid the neediest students. The availability and amount of individual grants have diminished in proportion to an increase in spending for loans.

It's a deficiency in the program that impacts poor and lower-income students. To alleviate this problem, the commission recommended funds for grants be increased to needy students and work programs and private sector aid be emphasized.

While the commission made note of the problem with the neediest students not being addressed by financial aid programs, they found "no compelling reason to radically change the current system."

Certainly, no "radical" change is needed, but improvement is indeed drastically needed. The vastness of the financial aid bureaucracies with states, private banks and the federal government all staking-out various territories, really needs some tinkering to make the machine more responsive to the needs of individual students.

A strong federal commitment to financial aid is essential to the concept of educational opportunities for all.

Stop wasting time, abolish the Senate

The University Assembly should abolish the Senate.

The faculty voted Wednesday, in a slim margin, not to give the University Senate more power to make decisions. The decision of the faculty to retain the town hall type of government is good. It is a chance to see real democracy at work and to allow everyone who wants to, to be involved.

But having a Senate is a waste of time. The members of the Senate spent five hours amending and considering the governance system proposal and ended up approving the original proposal and the amended version of the plan.

The faculty virtually ignored the decisions of the Senate, not only in the governance issue, but also with important issues like the ROTC controversy in the past.

Why should the members of the Senate waste their time?

The Senate allows a few people to gain a false sense of power. The members of the Student University Affairs Board need to realize how little student representation they have.

Sure, they comprise one-third of the Senate. But the Senate is worthless. And 18 students compared to 970 faculty — even to the 150 or so faculty who show up at meetings — does not seem especially powerful.

The Assembly should establish a rules committee to deal with issues that need clarification or research before the entire assembly meets. The committee should pass no judgment on the motion, but simply provide information to the faculty and SUAB members.

The Senate is a symbol of bureaucracy. Slash it and slash some red tape.



If you care, view The Day After

This Sunday ABC television will show one of the most controversial — and important — movies ever presented: *The Day After*. It should be viewed by all students and citizens concerned about the threat of nuclear war — and by all those who haven't yet become concerned.

thus far, failed completely. NATO's policy really is that it will not rule out initiating use of nuclear weapons in Europe. Despite repeated overtures from the Soviet Union to sign a mutual no first use pledge, NATO has consistently refused to modify its policy. (In June, 1982, the USSR finally announced unilaterally that it would never be the first to use nuclear weapons.)

comments sherri schultz

The film portrays the effects of a nuclear war on the inhabitants of Lawrence and Kansas City.

The war begins when Soviet troops invade Western Europe after NATO deploys American cruise and Pershing II missiles there. NATO uses tactical nuclear weapons to repel the troops, and the conflict escalates into an all-out nuclear war between the superpowers.

The film is devastating. People should see it with their families or friends and discuss their feelings afterward, or come to the open viewing at 8 p.m. Sunday in the Forum Room.

The film is more than a step toward "imagining the unimaginable." It is a horror movie like no other because after it is over, we cannot comfort ourselves with the thought that "it's just a movie."

NATO really does plan to deploy cruise and Pershing II missiles in Europe — beginning in just two weeks. The men Pres. Ronald Reagan charged with negotiating a treaty to limit that deployment have,

Finally, and perhaps most dangerously, NATO's — and the Reagan administration's — policies really are based on the belief that nuclear war can be limited and controlled. Expert studies by strategists and psychologists have concluded that even the use of a few nuclear weapons would lead to an all-out nuclear war, just as it does in *The Day After*. Yet the Reagan defense department is currently following a Guidance Plan leaked to the press (*Eugene Register-Guard*, Jan. 20) which calls for the United States to develop the capability to fight, control, and win "protracted" nuclear wars of up to six months' duration.

The Day After poses no solution to the nuclear arms race, nor a way to avoid the dreadful scenario it portrays. This is our responsibility. We must use the University's tremendous resources to educate ourselves, join with others who are concerned, and translate our knowledge into concrete and effective political action. Transforming the despair we feel after viewing *The Day After* into such positive actions is our best means of ensuring that such a day will never come to pass.

Sherri Schultz is a member of Students for a Nuclear Free Future and is ASUO executive assistant.

letters

Smokescreen

When has an individual constituted a group? In a recent *Emerald* editorial, it says, "The EMU rent question is an obvious attack on OSPIRG by the same group that took them before the Constituion Court." I brought OSPIRG before the court and handled the case myself.

As for the *Emerald's* claim about a "smokescreen," the reason it is "wholly transparent" is because there is no smokescreen. I raised the question of OSPIRG paying rent during the court hearing because the group is a non-profit corporation and because it seemed to be conducting business this summer when it collected donations during the canvassing project.

After hearing about my asser-

tions, some EMU Board members decided a policy was needed to handle discrepancies of who should pay rent. The *Emerald* pays rent, and the *Oregon Commentator* will be paying rent for its office space. The criterion used to charge these two newspapers now must be reconciled with and compared to the Student Projects, Inc. and OSPIRG.

The *Emerald's* implication that I conspired with Incidental Fee Committee member Marc Spence and EMU Board Chariman Dan Cohen is amusing. Spence and I disagree on most policy issues, and, in fact, Spence told me he wished I never had raised the OSPIRG question. As for the *Emerald's* contention that Cohen spoke with me in August, he spoke with the *Commentator* publisher. I have not seen or spoken to Cohen since last spring. The issue has taken a life of its own without my prodding.

Conspiracy theories simplify complex questions, but these theories usually fail to explain such questions adequately or accurately.

Richard Burr
editor, oregon commentator

Crystal ball

Why does the *Emerald* make so many factual errors and write so many absurd statements in every editorial about the ASUO Executive, Incidental Fee Committee and EMU Board?

First, the implication that any *Oregon Commentator* staff

member other than Richard Burr was in any way involved in Burr v. OSPIRG is totally erroneous. Nor has the paper endorsed the idea that OSPIRG pay rent, although some staff members think it should, or asked Cohen to address the question.

Second, it is no mystery why *Oregon Commentator* received office space. My understanding is that *Oregon Commentator* was the only group that wanted office space, that wanted Room 203. All other groups wanted other spaces, the *Emerald* apparently abhors efficiency.

Third, Cohen was not informed of the *Commentator* by Editor Richard Burr in August. They agree they haven't spoken to each other since spring term. And if Cohen in August assumed as fact the idea of a new publication on campus, which has been considered for years and tried before, I only can commend him for his confidence in fellow students and his foresight, or ask him where he keeps his crystal ball. The final decision to publish the *Commentator* was not made until the second week of October.

I don't deny that Cohen and I are friends, but I, as a former *Emerald* ASUO associate editor, state emphatically that Cohen did nothing suspicious or unethical in handling EMU Board business addressed by the editorial. Thus, I would rather have a friend like Dan Cohen rather than a "friend" like Debbie Howlett.

Dane Claussen
publisher, oregon commentator

Friday, November 18, 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 | 686-5511 | Editor | Debbie Howlett |
| Display Advertising and Business | 686-3712 | Managing Editor | Sandy Johnstone |
| Classified Advertising | 686-4343 | News Editor | Frank Shaw |
| Production | 686-4381 | Assistant News Editor | Brenda Thornton |
| Circulation | 686-5511 | Editorial Page Editor | Cort Fernald |
| | | Photo Editor | Dave Kao |
| | | Sports Editor | Doug Levy |
| | | Sidelines Editor | John Healy |
| | | Entertainment Editor | Angela Allen Morgan |
| | | Assistant Entertainment Editor | Kim Carlson |
| | | Night Editor | Frank Shaw |
| | | Associate Editors | |
| | | Higher Education | Doug Nash |
| | | Departments and Schools | Melissa Martin |
| | | Student Government | Jim Moore |
| | | Features | Joan Herman |
| | | Politics | Brooks Darrif |
| | | Community | Michele Matassa |
| | | General Staff | |
| | | Advertising Manager | Darlene Gore |
| | | Classified Advertising | Sally Oljar |
| | | Production Manager | Victoria Koch |
| | | Controller | Jean Ownbey |