

## State of the Union address confusing

Just when you think you know what George Bush is all about, he turns around and does something that catches everyone by surprise.

After his 1991 budget was unveiled Monday, Bush's State of the Union address Wednesday night was generally viewed as anti-climatic. Leaks from the White House said the president would discuss education goals for the year 2000, and do a general overview of his domestic agenda. A nice, typical State of the Union speech. Unexciting and boring with few specifics, full of rhetoric.

But Bush had other ideas, and announced bigger troop cuts in Europe and a new call for a conventional arms control agreement.

Instead of clarifying his viewpoint, Wednesday's speech just made Bush more confusing than ever. It's hard to tell just *what* he believes in. His vagueness is now more difficult to interpret than it ever was before.

For instance, his proposal to withdraw an additional 50,000 combat troops from Central Europe came as a pleasant surprise. Last June he proposed to withdraw only 30,000 U.S. troops from Western Europe. With the removal of these troops, all of whom are stationed in West Germany, the United States would have 195,000 troops in Central Europe.

Up until his speech, Bush had said he would not support deeper cuts in NATO troops. Key Democratic officials pushed him to make bigger concessions, but he refused. Until Wednesday night. It is good to see that despite rumors of a shake up in the Kremlin, Bush is still moving, however slowly, toward continued defense cuts.

But while he made concessions in troop levels, his so-called "peace dividend" budget failed to live up to his oratory. With only a 2 percent cut in the overall defense budget, Bush seems to be sending mixed messages to both his allies and the Soviet bloc.

In the past, Bush has been accused of dragging his feet in foreign policy decisions, seemingly content to let Gorbachev set the arms-control negotiation schedule. While Eastern Europe crumbled, Bush had a wait-and-see attitude; satisfied with staying on the sidelines while others made decisions. Comedians mocked his "prudent" image.

Instead of setting a concrete, coherent foreign policy, Bush has stalled until events run ahead of him, and he is forced to leapfrog forward with startling proposals. The troop cut plan is a prime example.

As for his domestic agenda, Bush reiterated his stance: drugs bad, education good. But while he budgeted billions to fight the drug war, the self-styled "education president" has continued to let higher ed as well as the public education system fall apart. He has slashed Pell Grant appropriations and let the education budget stagnate.

Bush said Wednesday he wants to make America a leader in math and science by the year 2000, but he isn't willing to put up the money to finance it.

So Bush's State of the Union address, seen in hindsight, seems to consist of a thin layer of political eloquence backed up with large amounts of vague, muddled proposals. While past presidents have always relied on the art of the amorphous policy, Bush takes it to the extreme.

While one can applaud the new troop cut proposal, Bush's State of the Union address was typically unsatisfying. It will be difficult to support any of Bush's policies until there are real proposals on the table to back up his verbal commitments. And that doesn't look to happen anytime in the near future.



## Letters

### Too many

Looks like too many letters to answer line for line in a 250-word essay, huh? Let me cross as many of the complaints to my Jan. 26 letter as possible with a few indirect statements.

First, when a person chooses to engage in sex, the female has no absolute guarantee that she will not become pregnant. Therefore, since sex is not at all a necessity, one should always be prepared for a pregnancy before engaging. Is that too tough for any of you intellectuals to follow?

By prepared, I don't mean have the number of an abortionist handy. It is a fact that, if any procedure is executed which destroys what, if instead cared for, would have become a human being, we have an act of murder. This is not some open-ended statement, folks. A lot of people who would have been my friends simply are not here.

That's what it's all about... life is not cheap. Perhaps many of you think it is, because the relationships you have are so shallow you really might not miss a particular friend if they just weren't here anymore.

I hope this has made some of you think. I guess some think that maybe I just write to exercise my "logic whip," or to intimidate or antagonize. As I have said before, I really wish to reason with people personally, but it seems very few think it worthwhile. Maybe they are really just afraid to be responsible for their beliefs at a personal level?

Bob Weigel  
Lab tech

### Pay attention

When the *Emerald* editorialized Jan. 31 against the Bush budget proposal, for all the faults of the budget they pointed out, they forgot that the *Emerald* is a school newspaper and has some responsibility to pay attention to educational affairs. The proposed budget includes cutting of Pell Grants and a level of growth in the education budget far below the

rate of inflation.

Once again, education is getting the short end of the stick from the "education president" and the *Emerald* forgot to mention this.

When this budget is reworked, the senators who will be representing us are the same senators who went belly-up-at-breakfast with President Bush and supported the exportation of students to a country where their lives are at risk. Good ol' Bob and Mark.

The *Emerald* needs to pay a little more attention to what is going on that affects students, because we can't hold our breath waiting for the *Register-Guard* or our senators to bring it up.

Ivan Frishberg  
ASLCC

### Hard work

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate some individuals for their hard work and commitment to the student body here at the University.

Andy Clark was instrumental in getting Dr. Harry Edwards to visit our campus and speak on the sad state of sports and minorities in America. As an Edwards-described "pathological liberal," I found his presentation a perfect follow-up to *Do the Right Thing* and much more enlightening than the "best quarterback" controversy currently raging on these pages.

My only regret was that more athletes and Athletic Department officials did not attend, but I guess that was part of Edwards' point. Regardless, his very presence signified to me that student government will no longer be completely submissive to the A.D., and perhaps even question their "divine" sovereignty.

Karen Bubb, Kris Petersen, Shelia Stickel and Will White have bled themselves and their resources dry in order to make Taking AIM the success it has been. It was my distinct privilege to watch their efforts pay off into this worthy endeavor, and anyone who attended any of the month's events knows what I mean.

I know it has not been the *Emerald's* normal behavior to associate anything positive with the ASUO Executive so far this year, but I hope this will see print because the people mentioned above certainly deserve some kind of acknowledgment.

Christopher Matz  
Student

### More Montana

There will always be those people in the world who hate the San Francisco 49ers. I don't know why, maybe they're just jealous of the Niners' success, but to deny that Joe Montana is the greatest quarterback ever is simply a case of bias.

I couldn't believe Michael Simon (*ODE*, Jan. 26) when he tried to convince *Emerald* readers that Don Majkowski was a better quarterback than Montana. Simon stated that the ability to make a comeback was a major factor in the greatness of a quarterback, but a look at just one season doesn't cut it.

Simon failed to look at Montana's entire career. Just last year, Montana had eight comeback victories compared to none for Majkowski. In two games (Bengals and Giants) Montana threw last-second touchdowns for the victory.

This year, Montana had six compared to Majkowski's eight. That's 14 to eight over the past two years, and it's far more over their careers. And nobody performs under the ultimate pressure, the Super Bowl, better than Montana.

Comparing Montana and Majkowski is like comparing Joe DiMaggio and Jose Canseco. Majkowski and Canseco are good; I won't deny that, but Montana and DiMaggio are the greatest ever at their positions. Montana is a shoo-in for the Hall of Fame. I wish I could say the same for Majkowski.

Open your eyes and be a good sport — give Joe Montana the credit he deserves.

Matt Morin  
Journalism

## Commentary Policy

The *Oregon Daily Emerald* welcomes commentaries from the public concerning topics of interest to the University community.

Commentaries should be between 750 and 1,000 words, legible and signed, and the identification of the writer must be verified upon submission. The *Emerald* reserves the right to edit for grammar, style and length if necessary.

Commentaries will be published as space and time permit. Because of these limitations, the *Emerald's* commentary space cannot be used as a forum for debate and response between individuals or for matters that are better dealt with in the letters section. Writers may only submit one commentary a month.