

Bush's first 100 days lack direction, action

The time passed by so quickly — and most importantly, so quietly — that George Bush's first 100 days as president could have been an episode of the "Twilight Zone," where people are left wondering, "Just who is leading this nation?"

It appears as though Bush hasn't done much of anything — and even then, he has been quick to delegate authority and responsibility to avoid the limelight.

But is the spotlight the only reason for Bush's shyness? No. Bush just has very little to do, and no gumption to do it.

So Doonesbury's not-so-candid portrayals of the invisible president aren't difficult to believe. But the country continues to approve of him, though they don't know what he's doing.

Why question while the course seems smooth?

It has long been obvious that Bush is the antithesis of the center-stage-seeking Ronald Reagan. But now that Bush has ridden into office on Reagan's coattails, he may be wary of effecting changes, and of undoing some of Reagan's wrongs.

In this respect, Bush is unlike almost every president in recent memory. Bush's first 100 days were far from a flurry of inspiring activity, far from the "take charge and set the nation on a new course" ideology.

It's obvious that Bush has very little to offer. And it's time he do something to change that.

Nowhere is Bush's passivity more recognizable than in his approach to the nation's first national disaster in the 100 days — the Valdez oil spill. While the miles-long oil slick grew, Bush was busy with the annual Easter egg roll on the White House's back lawn.

A few days later, the environmental tragedy became known, and Bush dispatched other officials to the site for observation and reports.

We're not saying that Bush should've pulled a Reagan, and headed for the spill accompanied by Air Force One and the glare of television cameras. But for this new president, who has tried to dramatize his concern for the environment, the personal snub of the spill just wasn't expected or appreciated.

Perhaps it's unfair to chastise Bush for his behind-the-scenes method of leadership. True, Bush brought an end to the battle with Congress over Contra aid, and has tried to fend-off the savings and loan crisis — but we feel as though the nation has been kept in the dark as to what goes on behind the Oval Office doors.

Bush may not be a strong, up-front political leader — this much is known. But if the first 100 days are any indication, Bush isn't much of a president at all. Years from now, people might wonder, "Who was president after that actor guy?"



Don't sell state oil and natural gas leases

Despite the feelings of a majority of Oregon residents, a proposed federal offshore oil and natural gas lease sale is inexorable.

In the past, states that have attempted to bar such lease sales have lost in the courts. And if that's not bad enough, the Minerals Management Service (an agency of the Department of the Interior) has decided to follow through with the 1991 plan, although they haven't studied the possible detrimental effects on marine life critical to Oregon's fishing industry.

Research also indicates all of the state's offshore oil deposits would only fulfill the nation's gas needs for three days. Is it worth it to destroy the coast's scenic beauty over what conservation efforts could prevent? Not at all — and certainly not for three days.

But plans to counteract the effects are in the making. Because there remains little hope of reversing the federal decision, Oregon is taking the responsibility of protecting its coast under its own wing, in the form of legislation from the Ocean Resources Task Force.

The "holistic" plan contains five parts — which will identify, manage and protect marine resources from high tide marks to the state's 3-mile ocean boundary. The worthy items addressed are:

- Who is entitled to manage marine re-

sources? In Oregon's case, with such a minuscule (comparatively) amount of gas and oil deposits for which to drill, it would be best if Oregon officials could come to manage the operations. That, however, remains to be seen.

- Ocean pollution. Oregonians pride themselves on the coast's beauty and cleanliness; it would be horrific for the federal government to strip from us what we've worked so hard at maintaining.

- Renewable marine sources. As was already pointed out, the government has yet to study effects in this area.

- Leases for oil, natural gas, marine minerals and aquaculture. Again, this should be left in the state's domain.

- The creation of reserves to protect areas rich in specific kinds of fish. We hope the federal government has the foresight to protect reserves; if not, the state deserves control of this too.

The possibility remains that the Minerals Management Service will back off — will decide there's not enough interest or reserves to proceed with the 1991 plan. But we remain wary. After all, hasn't the federal government long ignored the state's concerns over log exports, the spotted owl and old growth forests?

Letters

Stop rape

I agree with Lindy Holt (ODE, April 25) — to a point. I advise women not to walk alone at night due to the risk of being sexually attacked — for now, until this risk is eliminated.

I agree that safety can only be achieved through motivating the individual. Men, each of us is responsible for doing what we are able, to eliminate rape from our society.

But Holt's letter attempts to place this burden on women. Most victims of rape are acquainted with their attacker. Most rapes occur in the victim's home. Should women then avoid being home, or coming into contact with the men they know? This is where Holt's logic takes us.

Rapes are committed by males. Males are responsible for the elimination of rape.

Women have the right to be safe whenever, wherever they may be. Until we men do all we are able to ensure women this right, they will be forced to live with rape's possibility as one of their greatest fears, which is in itself a subtle and constant form of rape in itself, by all men upon all women.

Men, stop rape and free us all of its fear and responsibility. If you're a man, do something. If you're a woman, demand that men do something.

Craig Myers
Eugene

Wrenching issue

Brigitte Leach, of Students for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, informs us that she favors a lifestyle that does not discomfit her fellow creatures (ODE, April 18), except possi-

bly the human ones.

She does not wear leather, eat meat or, presumably, perform scientific experiments on other animals. Whether conscience requires such restraint is a moral question, and I have no particular expertise in that field. I feel more at home with facts, and I think Leach has overlooked a few.

In order to support Leach's rapacious appetite for helpless vegetables, instruments of mass slaughter (known for obvious reasons as harrows) are dragged through the fields of America, bringing agonizing death to millions of moles, gophers, mice, voles, rabbits, shrews, worms, bugs, centipedes — the list goes on but I cannot! That seemingly harmless bowl of mush is a charnel house of unoffending creatures!

Furthermore, Leach is, herself, a vast chemical laboratory in which innocent microbes are

constantly subjected to experimentation by her immune system. These experiments are not conducted for the advancement of science, nor do they in any way increase the store of human knowledge. Their only purpose is to destroy their helpless subjects, so that Leach may continue her depredations.

It is not my place to tell Leach how to mend her ways.

Whether she must take active steps to suppress her immune system, or merely stop eating and die is the sort of wrenching moral issue she seems to feel right at home with. I'm sure she'll let me know all about whatever she decides.

Jerome Berryhill
GTF, physics

Letters Policy

The Emerald will attempt to print all letters containing comments on topics of interest to the University community. Comments must be factually accurate and refrain from personal attacks on the character of others.

Letters to the editor must be limited to no more than 250 words, legible, signed and the identification of the writer must be verified when the letter is submitted.

The Emerald reserves the right to edit any letter for length or style.