

Editorial

Eugene City Council is dragging its feet

It has been more than two months since Eugene voters passed a nuclear-free zone ordinance and the City Council has yet to implement any of its provisions. While some of the ordinance's provisions may have legal snags, critics correctly cite that the council is, and has been, dragging its feet.

This, however, is not surprising. In November, the City Council was deadlocked in a 4-4 tie on whether to endorse the initiative. Mayor Brian Obie broke the tie, and the council voted to oppose the measure.

Eugene Commissioner Bill Rogers voiced stronger opposition. Not only did he vote against the measure, he actively campaigned against it, saying he was unwilling to "put a great deal of effort or staff time into implementing" the measure. So from the start, the nuclear-free zone was fighting an administrative uphill battle.

Now the City Council says the roadblocks to implementing the initiative's provisions deal with constitutionality. It is concerned that some of the tenets of the ordinance may conflict with state and federal laws.

No nuclear-free zone in the nation has yet been ruled unconstitutional, and the Eugene ordinance draws all of its provisions from already-existing nuclear-free zones.

Even if the Eugene nuclear-free zone pre-empts state or federal authority, and there is no precedent to indicate that it does, corrective measures to its provisions could be rewritten by the council, or better yet, through a voter referendum.

The council also is concerned with the administrative power the Nuclear-Free Zone Board may assume — if indeed it ever is assembled — as well as the provision allowing private citizens the right to sue for violations of the ordinance.

But these two hurdles easily could have been cleared, for the council has the power to amend the provisions of the ordinance.

Although we by no means recommend that the council drastically alter the ordinance, these are minor points of contention compared to the so-called question of constitutionality and could have been resolved by now if the council truly wanted to expedite the will of the voters.

The City Council risks being labeled insensitive to Eugene citizens by using its objections as a rationalization not to implement the program. It would be in the council's best interest to resolve the matter quickly and work out the bugs later.

Letters Policy

The Emerald will attempt to print all letters containing fair comment on topics of interest to the University community.

Letters to the editor must be limited to 250 words, typed, signed and the identification of the writer must be verified when the letter is turned in. The Emerald reserves the right to edit any letter for length or style. Letters to the editor should be turned into the Emerald office, Suite 300, EMU.

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, 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: Susan Thelen
Production Manager: Wayne Lottinville
Classified Advertising: Alyson Simmons
Assistant to the Publisher: Jean Ownbey

Advertising Sales: Peter LaFleur / Sales Manager
Teresa Acosta, Brent Collins, Beryl Israel, Janelle Heitmann, Laura Goldstein, Catherine Lilja, Rick Martz, Joseph Menzel, Peter Miller, Joan Wildermuth.

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

Editor
Managing Editor: Lucinda Dillon
News Editor
Spectrum Editor: Michael Rivers
Spectrum Assistant Editor: Curtis Condon
Editorial Page Editor: Stephen Maher
Editorial Page Assistant Editor: James Young
Sports Editor: Michael Drummond
Photo Editor: Capi Lynn
Graphic Design Editor: Michael Wilhelm
Night Editor: Lorraine Rath
Michael Rivers

Associate Editors
Community: Jolayne Houtz
Politics: Shawn Wirtz
Higher Education / Administration: Chris Norred
University Affairs: Stan Nelson
Student Government: Sarah Kitchen
Student Activities: Tonnie Dakin
General Assignment: Dennis Fernandes

Reporters: Sean Axmaker, Mary Courtis, Karen Creighton, Gary Henley, Carolyn Lamberson, John McBarron.

Photographers: Sherlyn Bjorkgren, Shu-Shing Chen, Maria Corvallis, Derrel Hewitt, Bobbie Lo, James Marks, Dan Wheeler, Michael Wilhelm.

Production: Michele Ross / Ad Coordinator
Kelly Alexandre, Elizabeth Asher, Ronwin Nicole Ashton, Virginia Baniaga, Sandra Bevans, Sara Briscoe, Shu-Shing Chen, Janet Emery, Lisa Haggerty, Donna Leslie, Curtis Lott, Kelli Mason, Mike McGraw, Rob Miles, Angelina Muniz, Julie Paul, Ingrid White, X. Kang Xie.



Merit-based

My how the times have changed. Here I find myself supporting an initiative by our new Governor, Neil Goldschmidt's new inventive and experimental program calling for a merit-based scholarship program warrants serious consideration.

Yes, the governor is right. According to the ODE article on Jan. 14, only 60 percent of Oregon's brightest stay in Oregon. It is about time we tried to retain the other 40 percent.

One argument against the program goes: Students who attend out of state institutions do so because of "church related" reasons. Even if this argument were true for most students, it is impossible to believe that this is true for the gifted, bright students. When was the last time that you heard someone going to Harvard or Stanford because of their divinity schools?

And then there is Students for a Progressive Agenda (SPA) supported by student body president Steve Nelson. It is about time that Steve starts to realize that he represents all of the students and not just the few

represented by SPA.

Steve wants all of the money to go into need-based programs. But Steve, that is how most of the money is now spent, and it has not solved the problem of brain drain in Oregon.

The new program, Steve, is only an experiment. It should have a chance to succeed or fail.

I urge all students concerned with this matter to call Steve at his office — it's about time Steve heard from the rest of us at the University.

Ron E. Munion
Political science, history

Resisters

The article, "Men who avoid draft registration could lose many benefits," (ODE, Jan. 15), appeared to be just a government press release intended to increase compliance with the law. Unfortunately, the article was very misleading.

The increasing likelihood of a draft was not mentioned. Yet U.S. policies in Central America are leading to a war requiring a draft. Even if this war is forestalled, the probability of a draft remains high due to the shrinking pool of military-aged men.

Citing a 1984 Brookings Institute report, the Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors stated, "...the Pentagon may in fact be facing recruitment shortfalls in the next eight years. At that time the Pentagon may call for a peacetime draft to compensate for these shortfalls, as they appear unlikely to consider reducing recruitment incentives." (The Objector, Dec. 1985).

Obviously, draft registration presents a real risk of being forcing registrants into the military and war. The risk now applies to all registrants — student deferments have been eliminated.

While ignoring these circumstances, the article exaggerated the costs of resisting registration. The fact is that out

of about 600,000 non-registrants, only 19 have been indicted since 1980. The other major penalty for students losing financial aid is offset by alternative funds for resisters.

Lastly, the article ignored the most important issue of all: Draft registration is a vote for war — any war which is pursued by the government. In contrast, resisting draft registration constitutes a powerful blow against a misguided foreign policy and the wars which it spawns.

Steve Kasner
History

Unbiased

Frederick Leff and Steve McCormick have made assertions that will be answered. You will come to realize that it is not we that lack homework time. Mr. McCormick (ODE, Jan. 16); nor is it we that are a bit confused. Mr. Leff (ODE, Jan. 14).

Your gravest errors are due to your lack of thought in most areas. You both fail to take your theories to their furthest conclusions. The implications of my conclusion and yours is that the other has seriously misinterpreted the facts. That is to say that I feel just as repulsed by you claiming to be a science major as you do I.

Let us duel with the facts (please, no more doctrines you've merely been taught, but truths that you have extrapolated).

By the way, the next time you hear someone say that the Bible is full of contradictions, laugh at them and say you know someone just waiting (and waiting) for the chance to give away \$400 for that information.

Be rest assured that we will document our sources, as will be expected of you, and we will be using nothing but established, nonreligious, unbiased facts.

Brian Frary
Biology
Charlie Richards
Economics