

editorial

Wording of House measure is unclear

Following Thursday's passage of a House amendment that specifies the provisions under which Congress would allow the president to commit troops to Nicaragua, an Oregonian headline stated, "House votes to limit U.S. troop use in Nicaragua," while a Register Guard headline read, "House bill OKs using U.S. troops." The separate articles contained almost identical information obtained from the Los Angeles Times.

The measure specifies that Congress will approve the dispatch of troops into Nicaragua when there is "a clear and present danger" to the United States, its allies, embassies, or citizens; in a response to acts of terrorism, or upon the introduction of Soviet MiG aircraft or nuclear weapons into Nicaragua, but its meaning seemed to befuddle the press and legislators alike. The wording of the measure, which is unclear, appears to be the source of the confusion.

Legislators who support the bill and say they do not want U.S. troops in Nicaragua, say that the measure inhibits the president's ability to commit troops to the troubled region. Those opposed contend that the bill's wording leaves it open to wide interpretation, and that the measure could be seen as a House approval of military intervention. The opposition also asserts that the bill parrots the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, a measure that set the stage for U.S. military intervention in Vietnam.

The disparity of opinions was also evident in the votes of Oregon's representatives. Republican Denny Smith, who scored a 100 percent Conservative Index rating (The 1985 index, which is tallied by editors of The Review of the News, is based on congressional voting records.) found himself opposing the bill with Les AuCoin, who is a liberal Democrat. Conservative Republican Bob Smith shared support of the bill with Democrats Jim Weaver and Ron Wyden, who scored indexes of 20 and 10 respectively.

It is unclear as to whether the measure is an effort to limit the president or whether it is a disguised attempt to facilitate military intervention. But if the House truly was seeking limitation, why did it pass such a vague collection of specifications? Because the measure does not specify what the House would consider "danger" or "terrorism" to include, a president eager to go to war probably wouldn't be hard pressed to find examples of both.

NCAA regulations impose stiff penalties on cheaters

The overwhelming support of the University and other National Collegiate Athletic Association schools of guidelines that will impose stiffer penalties on schools guilty of repeat rule infractions, is a formidable attempt to crack down on cheating. The new regulations, including the so-called "death penalty," were designed to combat activities such as illegal recruiting, point shaving, and awarding undeserved credits to athletes. The citing of the University for giving phony credits to football players in 1980 is just one example of the problems that have plagued the NCAA in recent years.

The "death penalty," which calls for the two-year suspension of a team that violates a rule within five years of another team from the same school, may be medicine that some schools find hard to swallow. But perhaps its introduction will encourage athletic departments to play by the rules.



commentary

Slowing of park development recommended by lay planners

The "Riverfront Park" is continuing forward without adequate recognition of the decision making and planning processes in the University community. As those members of the University community who have served on local planning and land use commissions, we are disturbed by the process with which decisions regarding these important riverfront lands are being made.

•A non-profit development corporation has been set up which will control the development of the University's riverfront park lands.

•This corporation consists mostly of Eugene business persons and is holding meetings which are closed to the public.

•The land, which is to be developed by this corporation, was purchased with student housing funds. A soccer field, which cost about \$650,000, was constructed with student funds, and is likely to be destroyed for the development.

•A subcommittee of the Campus Planning Committee is soon to forward recommendations for groundlease conditions between the State Board of Educa-

tion and the development corporation. The groundlease conditions are undergoing their seventh revision.

As lay planners, we recognize the value of open consideration of planning issues. Open deliberations foster wider community participation, and build support for well-conceived and evaluated development proposals. Land use decisions regarding the University's riverfront property are already governed by two adopted planning documents of the University: the North Campus Plan, adopted in 1982, and the Campus Transportation Plan, adopted in 1975. Areas of conflict between the "Riverfront Park" and these plans were enumerated in a memorandum to the Campus Planning subcommittee from David Rowe, university planner, in January, 1985. The "Riverfront Park" concept is inconsistent with these adopted plans in numerous major respects. For example, the North Campus Plan recognizes that the area along the river is to be reserved for student playing fields and other recreational uses.

Changes in plans should not proceed on an *ad hoc* basis, but rather after evaluation of all factors which might contribute to a change in land use. This process of evaluation includes public hearings and deliberations, followed by adoption of revised land use criteria. Following such revisions, which should occur at the University level, and must occur at the city and regional level, developmental proposals might be appropriately considered if they are consistent with the new land use designation.

Instead, University officials have not moved to amend University planning documents. They are discussing development with several developers in meetings closed to the public with a develop-

ment corporation, which is insulated from the University community, and acting without public input. A process to amend the Metropolitan General Plan is underway, and it will take several months just to ascertain if the use of this land, as currently described in the General Plan, should be modified to some use consistent with a "Riverfront Park."

The stage in the "Riverfront Park" development process at the University-level is far forward of the land use decisions yet to be made. Furthermore, rushing through this process during the summer months does not allow the improvement in land use and development decisions that would result from fuller participation in the process by the University community. Lastly, we take note of the fundamental importance of planning processes practiced by public institutions, such as universities and governments, which establish patterns of land use. It is essential that these processes remain open and take into account existing plans in order to avoid chaotic patterns of land use which are detrimental and costly to the community.

We recommend that the process be slowed down. We affirm that changes in land use require amendment of University plans, which involves public hearings and open discussions. We urge that the planning processes of the University be followed before any issues surrounding development of University-owned riverfront lands are discussed.

By Howard Bonnett and Everett Smith

Howard Bonnett served as the Eugene planning commissioner from 1970-75, and Everett Smith served on the Boundary Commission from 1970-72 and served as the Lane County planning commissioner from 1974-77.

Oregon daily

emerald

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published on Tuesdays and Thursdays during the summer session except during exam week and vacations by the Oregon Daily Emerald Publishing Co., at the University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon, 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.

The Emerald is private property. The unlawful removal or use of papers is prosecutable by law.

General Staff

Advertising Director
Production Manager
Classified Advertising
Assistant to the Publisher

Susan Thelen
Russell Steele
Vince Adams
Jean Ownbey

Advertising Sales: Tim Clevenger, Michael Gray, Nancy Nielsen, David Wood.

Production: Vince Adams, Kelly Cornyn, Stormi Dykes, Kathy Gallagher, Kelly Neff, Michele Ross, Peg Solonika, Karen Stallwood, Colleen Tremaine, Hank Trotter.

Editor
Managing Editor, News Editor
Editorial Page Editor
Entertainment Editor
Photo Editor
Night Editor

Associate Editors
Administration
Higher Education, Community
Student Activities
Features

Reporters: Sean Axmaker, Robert Collias, Allan Lazo, Linda Hahn, Chris Hazen.

Photographers: Steven Gibbons, Jim Marks, Ross Martin, Hank Trotter.

News and Editorial
Display Advertising and Business
Classified Advertising
Production
Circulation

Julie Shippen
Diana Elliott
Michelle Brence
Sheila Landry
Karen Stallwood
Sheila Landry

Kirsten Bolin
Scott McFetridge
Julie Freeman
Marty Schwarzbauer

686-5511
686-3712
686-4343
686-4381
686-5511