

Combined Germany holds much promise

Tuesday's historic announcement of an eventual reunified Germany is probably the best indicator that the Cold War of the past 30 years is over.

The two Germanies sprang out of post-World War II hysteria. The Allies, determined to forever end the German threat on the European continent, divided the conquered country into four military sectors, controlled by the United States, France, Britain and the Soviet Union.

But as fears of communism grew, and the Allies refused to give up their share of Berlin (which was deep in the Soviet sector), the coalition forged out of a common enemy broke apart. The Soviet district became East Germany; the other three allies formed West Germany.

The ensuing years saw central Europe become the dividing line between East and West. The two countries lived in shadow of the superpowers. Experts agreed that if World War III started, it would most likely take place on German soil.

But with the democratization of Europe within the last year, East Germany and the rest of the bloc countries became free. Leaders of both East and West Germany began to speak, at first cautiously, then openly, of eventual reunification.

The other European countries gave guarded opinions on reunification. A combined Germany would dominate the continent geographically, and have the ability to exert economic and political control over the rest of the countries. European leaders were leary of such a strong force in the European Economic Community.

But the accord reached Tuesday between the United States, France, Britain, the Soviet Union and the two Germanies opens the door for reunification. While the actual event is still some time off, that the two countries will combine seems like a foregone conclusion.

The plan consists of two steps. In the first part, East and West German officials would hold a series of meetings to discuss the various difficulties reunification would involve. The second step would see the foreign ministers of both countries meet with various world powers (including the four who helped draw up the proposal) to discuss the ramifications reunification involved, and the role the new Germany will play in European security.

It's hard to find any problems in the plan. While some groups wanted instantaneous reunification, the six countries involved realized that was not a viable proposal. While both countries have strong cultural ties, many other bonds have been severed. For years, West Germans have been taught East Germans were traitors, and vice versa. Each harbors deep resentments. It will take a long time for both sides to get over the effects of the Cold War.

There remain many barriers to overcome before formal reunification is complete. Legal, economic, political and security issues must be resolved. The eleven other members of the EEC must decide what part a combined Germany will play in the organization.

While the proposal has mostly gotten a favorable response, some groups have gone on record in opposition. West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, who has been the architect of the plan, has been accused by some members of the West German Parliament for being politically opportunistic. They say he is using the reunification issue as a prop for his steadily deteriorating power base.

Politics may be behind some of Kohl's statements, but to charge him of such cynicism is too much. West Germany has always wanted a unified country (it's in their constitution) and chancellors in the past have brought up the subject only to face sharp rebukes from East German leaders. Kohl is only living up to this precedent, and should not be blamed for taking advantage when the situation warrants it.

East Germany will be holding its first free election on March 18. The reunification process will be set in motion right after that. From this end, there are no objections.

Letters Policy

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.



Letters

Sign up

Would whoever stole a full "stop the parking garage" petition from my office door kindly reveal yourself and your reason? Shall we assume you support the building of a garage? Let's talk about it, not rip down petitions.

Those who signed on the door last Thursday and Friday (Feb. 8 and 9) might want to sign again. Anyone else opposed to the garage — please come by PLC 19 and let your voice be heard.

Let's proceed in a reasonable manner, folks, and stop this parking garage madness.

Jeff Harrison
English GTF

Dream world

Unlike race or gender, sexual preference is a conscious choice. The attempts by homosexuals organizations to link themselves to the civil rights movement is nothing short of deplorable.

U.S. intelligence and military organizations have valid, proved reasons for refusing to employ self-professed homosexuals. These concerns include security, (most spies in the British and American governments have tended to be homosexuals) and organization moral (a combat unit with a known homosexual shows a much lower efficiency rating). In short, this is a rational screening process.

Neither the CIA nor the military is under any obligation to follow the Oregon Administrative Rules or any motion of the University Student Senate. These are federal agencies and are subject to federal laws. As a public school that receives federal money, the University has no right to bar these organizations from campus.

NYU and Princeton are private schools; they can do anything they want. The University must respond to the citizens of Oregon, and, despite what this isolated community may think, most Oregonians support a strong defense and a good in-

telligence gathering organization.

Maybe the University Student Senate will wake up from the dream world, and, if it doesn't, maybe the CIA will take them to court.

Eric Eckman
Eugene

Anonymous

This letter is addressed to our "Angry and Tired" neighbor. You left a rather unexpected note on our door Tuesday and unfortunately, I know neither your name nor number.

I realize that living near a fraternity can be an interesting and sometimes trying experience. Further, I realize that our activities at times, are a bit loud and come a bit late. The last thing that I want or need to have happen is to anger the people living around us; this is never our intention. I respect your position and appreciate your concern.

Please feel free to contact me at the chapter house in order to find a solution to the problem.

Michael Weaver
Phi Gamma Delta

Misinforms

In response to the T-shirt hanging in the ASUO office, which reads "See Dick with Jane. See Dick with Pat. See Dick with AIDS. Don't be a Dick." This T-shirt is probably meant to be a positive attempt AIDS awareness. However it fails miserably; instead, it is a sexist portrayal of a life-threatening virus.

Because "Pat" is not a gender specific name, it leads one to assume that in our predominately heterosexual society that the name refers to a woman. This is offensive, because it implies that woman are the leading cause of the spread of AIDS. Statistically, women only pass the virus 25 percent of the time, where as men pass

it 100 percent of the time during intercourse.

The T-shirt does not serve its purpose. Instead of causing AIDS awareness, it misinforms the general public who is vulnerable. The T-shirt should clarify that anyone could catch or pass AIDS. The shirt blames women for AIDS, and portrays Dick as the victim. You don't have to be homosexual, you don't have to be a drug user, and you assuredly don't have to be a woman to have AIDS.

Everyone is a victim. AIDS doesn't discriminate. Nor should we.

Barbara Rodgers
Speech-RCHM

Bummer

In response to all those writing letters saying that automobile drivers are all indirectly or directly responsible for the recent oil spill; that's B.S.

I don't own a car — have never owned one — although I was given a license 8 years ago. I do bike or take the bus. To put the blame on drivers is unfair. To all those who really want to protest this by not driving then you need to also not use plastics or any other byproduct containing any chemicals, because oil is the source of all petrochemicals.

So maybe you all should move to leather, wool or fur, instead of polyester blends, but gee, that would probably hurt the animals (or you could go native, but that would hurt us), or switch to wood products in construction of appliances, but oops, that might hurt the trees. Bummer.

Oh, well, maybe you can just move in to the woods, but then, that might hurt the animals who need their space. Gee, life sucks; don't you hate when that happens?

Stop blaming car drivers for all the problems, because guess where bike parts come from?

Jerrick Juliette
Chemistry GTF