

Summit shaping up to a real discussion

It was originally intended as a sort of get-to-know-you summit meeting. Meet on a boat in Malta for a couple of days, exchange greetings, set the guidelines for future conferences, and then go home.

Happily, the so-called Summit at Sea has turned into something much more important.

With the Wall gone, and changes in Eastern Europe occurring literally overnight, there is an opening for both sides to make major cuts in both troop sizes and defense budgets.

President Bush has been criticized in the last few months for being "unresponsive" and "lackadaisical" toward the events in Communist world. Most likely, because of pressure from both the media and the general public, Bush has been forced to take a more active stand on issues, and alter his strategy for the Dec 2-3 summit.

Right now, Bush seems ready to "talk" about cuts in conventional and non-nuclear weapons, as well as changes in the strategic nuclear forces of both sides.

Talk. Not deal, but discuss the possibility of action in the future.

While the Summit at Sea has not evolved into an arms-reduction meeting, it has changed from Bush's original idea of a chat on Soviet and Eastern Europe economics.

White House aides are insisting the summit will not turn into an arms control talk, and not to expect anything concrete to come out of it. But the fact the Bush and his cronies are actually willing to talk about defense comes a welcome surprise.

Once again, Gorbachev has been the instigator of reform in American-Soviet relations. He was the one that announced deep cuts in general troop deployments in Eastern Europe. He was the one that set the agenda for the summit. Bush had to say he was open to suggestions, or face even more erosion in his popularity polls.

This will be the first summit between the two leaders. Gorbachev is already a veteran at high-level conferences, having had several meetings with Reagan. What comes out of this first summit will have implications for future meetings over the next few years.

Bush's staff members keep reiterating the phrase "options, but not specific proposals." Translated, that means Bush will talk about what's going on, but he doesn't want to be pinned down on any issue. Not yet.

The next summit is scheduled for sometime in 1990, somewhere in the United States. Hopefully, by then, both sides will be able to sit down, make concessions and hammer out their differences.

But in the meantime, the Summit at Sea holds great promise of future happenings.



Congress uses dirty tactics in pay raise

Well they finally did it, with or without the public's approval. Last week members of both houses of Congress passed pay raises for themselves.

Representatives' salaries will increase to \$96,000 a year in February 1990 and \$125,000 in January 1991. Representatives will not be allowed to keep any speaking fees. Senators' pay will increase to \$101,400 starting October 1990 and they can keep up to \$23,568 in speaking fees.

Now whether or not the pay raises were deserved is infinitely debatable. But one thing's for sure, the way in which Congress got itself the raise left something to be desired.

This past summer the issue of a Congressional pay raise created a furor. Some people were for it, while others were outraged at the idea. Due to such overwhelming controversy, Congress let the issue drop until a better time.

Apparently, last week seemed like the appropriate time. House Speaker Tom Foley (D-Wash) waited until the end of the legislative session when all important agenda items had gone through the House before bringing up the pay raise again.

So when public concern over the pay raise had died down and the media's attention was focused on other things, Foley brought the pay raise to the floor and pushed it through in two days before anyone knew what happened.

Somehow it seems wrong for members of Congress to sneak in a vote to raise their own pay, especially after this summer's controversy.

Perhaps the government should look at different ways to find out voters opinion on pay increases.

When the 12 amendments that later became the Bill of Rights were first put forward to be voted upon, included in them was a proposal to keep pay raises from going into effect until the next legislative session, meaning that candidates would have to go back to the voters for their support before being able to receive a raise.

Perhaps the more radical idea of putting a Congressional pay raise on the ballot would be the most effective way to gauge public opinion on the idea. After all, 'We the People' are the employers of our Congress and we deserve the right to authorize a pay hike.

Letters

Hatred is hatred

This is concerning the atmosphere of hatred and lies upon your campus. Every time I walk through your campus, or its close vicinity, I feel the eyes. I feel the eyes of hatred looking upon me. I see the posters declaring "Cultural Diversity," "Stop Racism," "Stop Homophobia," "Stop Sexism," etc., etc.

Listen up, kiddies! Hatred is hatred. Hatred exists everywhere. You are hated. You hate. Love? On your campus, in your frat houses, love is an orgasmic moan.

Love is a woman's cry of "Help me! Help me! Won't somebody please help me?!" Love is "Oh God! I'm coming!" Love is "You better run faster than that! You're dead!"

Come on kiddies, let's have a little bit of guts here. Be brave for once in your life to not deny yourself. We're caught in a sick relationship here. You hate me, I hate you, yet all I hear is "Peace, man, yeah" and all I see and feel is hatred.

If that is your idea of peace,

I.e. hatred held in check screw it. Be honest with yourself. Look at me. Open your mouth. Say "I hate you." Set yourself free just by the sound of it. Feel yourself get all warm inside by the comforting sound of me saying, "I hate you too."

After we've got that off our chests, we can go about our daily business with renewed vigor and freshness, for we have ended the lie.

Shane Rassmussen
Eugene

Last straw

I'm fed up with special interest groups on this campus who try to impose their misguided, self-serving opinions on the rest of us.

The latest bandwagon-of-the-month is those who are trying to ban the CIA from recruiting on campus. What these activists have apparently ignored is that by seeking to deny CIA access to this campus, they are discriminating against those of

us who may be interested in employment with the CIA.

Apparently, these activists consider themselves infinitely qualified to decide who can come to campus and recruit me. This is blatant discrimination: I would be denied the use of campus facilities for purposes of seeking gainful employment with the organization of my choice.

I think Tim Hughes, Shannon Oliver and company are reaching a bit when they suggest that the University condones CIA activity by allowing them to recruit on campus. The University isn't helping the CIA so much as it is us students: By assisting us in seeking gainful employment with the organization of our choice, the University is fulfilling an important function of an institution for higher education.

I suggest that those who disagree with CIA policies here and abroad find another forum to voice their protestations, and stop discriminating against those of us who may be considering employment with the CIA.

If you can protest the CIA on campus, I should be allowed to be interviewed by them on campus.

Todd Hedrick
Marketing/management

Outraged

I feel outraged at what I witnessed not more than 10 feet from me. I saw a young man and a young woman arrested by the police and placed in a van.

I asked someone standing next to me what happened, and the person said "they (the police) are arresting some students for non-violent civil disobedience." I then asked who called the police, and the person said "the University administration."

As an older student and a mother, I felt outraged and fearful that a Societal Environment acting as temporary "parents" in a academic "home" would invite the CIA to recruit its (the University's) young, then call the police and allow them to be

arrested for non-violent participating in a learning experience.

The outrage I feel cries of betrayal and abandonment. Shame on you!

Claire Giammario
Student

Backing it up

Yes, Myles, affirmative action is important. Thank you for saying so, but speaking isn't enough!

How can you personally justify:

1) The creation of a new faculty position in the philosophy department at a time of budget cuts without following affirmative action guidelines for recruitment.

2) Filling that position with your wife!

Why don't you put your money where your mouth is?

Danny Suire
Student