

Oregon Daily Emerald

Pushcart vendor tries
unconventional approach
See Page 2

Thursday, February 20, 1986

Eugene, Oregon

Volume 87, Number 102

IFC supports student vote on Commentator

By Kim Kaady
Of the Emerald

The Incidental Fee Committee unanimously voted Tuesday to recommend that the ASUO Constitution Court place the Oregon Commentator's budget on the general election ballot in April.

The IFC, which recommended a budget of \$3,428 for the student newspaper, based its decision on a recommendation from ASUO President Lynn Pinckney's administration.

"This was the only proposal the ASUO could agree to on a consensus basis," said Mary Kay Menard, ASUO assistant finance coordinator.

Menard said the ASUO executive staff decided on the amount after deciding that some aspects of the Commentator's \$9,684 proposed budget did not fall under the IFC category, including special equipment and an editor's stipend. She said some members also had questions about the level of student support for the Commentator.

"Anytime the IFC feels a group is questionable, we want to hear from

students before we allocate funds," Menard said.

The Commentator's request for \$9,684 in IFC funds was rejected at the meeting.

In response to the decision, the Commentator plans to appeal to the Constitution Court on the grounds of discrimination, said Executive Editor Tom Mann.

"(The ASUO) disagrees with the content of the paper, but they can't discriminate on the basis of political views," Mann said. He said he plans to submit a request for a hearing to the court today.

Mann and Doug Green, Commentator senior editor, contend that the paper follows every guideline required of campus student groups, and should automatically be awarded IFC funds. They, along with Rob Young, Commentator production manager, spoke with the IFC before the motion was passed.

The Commentator was given \$6,300 in IFC funds last year and also received money the previous year, Mann said. He contends the ASUO is trying to question

the "validity of our purpose" when it hasn't been questioned in the past by the IFC.

"We haven't changed in content or format for the past three years and have gotten funding for the past two," he said.

However, Menard said the IFC received "a lot of letters" last year from students, staff and faculty who opposed the Commentator and felt it should not be awarded IFC funds. She said the committee received three letters in support of the Commentator.

Mann said the Commentator has succeeded in its purpose to be an alternative journal of opinion at the University as well as being the only dissenting voice on campus.

IFC Chairman Jim Randall said the Commentator can withdraw its request for funds and is not required to go on the ballot. The Commentator can bring its proposal back to the IFC if the measure fails, but the IFC will not take further action until then, he said.



Rob Young, Doug Green and Tom Mann (left to right)

Nuclear deterrence is key to peace

By Andrew LaMar
Of the Emerald

The Soviet Union and United States should try to maintain a nuclear armament balance that would assure mutual destruction if a nuclear war were ever initiated, University physics professor John Moseley said Wednesday afternoon.

Moseley, also the University's acting vice president for research, spoke about the possible elimination of nuclear weapons to about 50 people in Gilbert Hall Wednesday.

The goal of eliminating nuclear weapons "is not as simple as we would like to think it is," Moseley said. There would be three major dangers once nuclear weapons were believed to be eliminated, he said.

One of the dangers would arise if a major conventional war the size of World War II ever broke out, he said. If one country were to start losing a major conventional war, it might consider building nuclear

weapons, which would make it superior in a nuclear-free world, he said.

"Even if nuclear weapons were eliminated, the knowledge would still exist," Moseley said.

When both nations have a substantial amount of nuclear weapons, cheating in the margins doesn't make much difference, he said, but if there were no weapons, any cheating could mean a big advantage.

In order to avoid any nuclear confrontation, both the Soviet Union and the United States must believe initiating a nuclear war would assure mutual destruction, he said.

Moseley said he would accept the proposal Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev presented to President Reagan last month. Gorbachev's proposal calls for the elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000.

Another danger of eliminating nuclear weapons would be the Soviet Union and the United States hiding some weapons after both countries had agreed to eliminate the weapons, he said. Weapon hiding would probably occur no matter how detailed on-site inspections became, he said.

The real struggle would be in eliminating the last few hundred nuclear weapons, he said.

"At the time, there would be, it would seem to me, a great temptation... to keep a few aces in the deck or up their sleeves somewhere just in case something went wrong somewhere in the future," Moseley said.

Nonetheless, the amount of nuclear weapons would be significantly reduced, he said. They probably would be reduced enough to eliminate first-strike capabilities and the possibility of a nuclear winter if an exchange were ever to occur, he said.

"The real danger is that one country or another maintains enough weapons so that they have the possibility to somehow mount a first strike — or at least they believe they could," he said.

One person suggested delivery systems for the weapons also would have to be eliminated if any honesty in the agreement were to be kept. But Moseley said it would be difficult to consider wiping out delivery systems without considering wiping out transportation systems such as airlines, which could deliver nuclear weapons.

"You could make it very difficult to build more nuclear weapons, but I think it is very difficult to have an exact count of the number that exists and keep a major power from hiding a large enough number of nuclear weapons to be of serious concern."

Moseley said delivery systems would definitely have to be controlled somehow. The problem with the Star Wars plan is that it assumes the delivery would be

Reagan's budget cuts building fund

President Reagan's recently proposed budget for fiscal year 1987 calls for the postponement of federal funding for two University science buildings that had been planned for construction later this year.

University officials had expected to receive an \$8.5 million appropriation for the buildings in March but are uncertain when the money will come.

The appropriation was to be the second installment of a federal grant totalling \$33 million for the building project. The money was allocated by Congress and signed by President Reagan as part of the fiscal year 1986 Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill.

The University received \$2.3 million last year to design the buildings. University officials were originally planning on breaking ground for the buildings in September.

Now the University hopes to receive the money sometime in the late summer and start construction on the buildings next spring, said John Moseley, the University's acting vice president for research. Nothing, however, is definite, Moseley said.

University officials have expressed their concern to Oregon Sens. Mark Hatfield and Bob Packwood, Moseley said.

"At the moment, Senators Hatfield and Packwood are responsible for getting the money free," Moseley said.

A story in Tuesday's Register-Guard incorrectly reported that the University had sent Charlene Curry, the University's director of government relations, to Washington, D.C. to help free up the funds, Moseley said.

Curry was sent to Washington to meet with government officials as part of her job, Moseley said.

"She's not going back to Washington just to meet with the President," Moseley said. "That's silly. This is an \$8 million project in a \$500 billion budget."

If the University doesn't get the money, it would be a serious blow to the University's efforts at economic development, he said. But the University does expect to get the money, he added.



John Moseley

Continued on Page 2