

## No obvious reason for Gulf conflict

The newest reason President Bush has given for the United States' presence in the Persian Gulf is by far his most creative.

The latest rhetoric used to justify military action against Iraq is the threat of the Arab country's development of a nuclear arsenal. While giving our boys in the Gulf a pep talk and sharing some turkey with them, Bush told them they were not only there to push Saddam Hussein and his forces out of Kuwait, but also to end his quest for nuclear weapons.

Another flip-flop on Bush's part about the real reasons behind our presence in the Gulf shows how worried the President is about a lack of support to back his threatening words toward Hussein.

Since the lesson of Vietnam, the public isn't willing to buy the simple good-guy, bad-guy reasons that have justified most "wars" until now. Red-baiting or its equivalents no longer work with a public that is still recovering from the wounds of an unpopular war.

It was easy for Roosevelt to get support for World War II, not only because he actually went to Congress and got permission, but also because the enemy was clear and present. Germany and Japan had been making displays of "naked aggression" for several years before the United States finally took action. It wasn't until one of these enemies attacked and American lives were lost that the United States felt it was necessary to intervene. There was clearly an enemy, and the goals of the military effort were perfectly clear as well.

The reason Bush is having trouble getting the full-fledged support he needs and wants is because the American public does not yet feel threatened by Hussein. By injecting nuclear weapons into the Middle East basket, Bush is trying to establish that threat.

It is too little too late. He has given too many different reasons why force is necessary. This has led to confusion from among the very people he needs for support. After the Vietnam War, Americans will no longer sacrifice their young every time leaders cry wolf. They have to believe there is a clear and present threat. That threat should be obvious.

The fact that Bush has had to scramble, flip-flop and do whatever else was necessary to garner support, should prove to him that there is no blatantly obvious reason to use force. He has not received popular support for offensive military use because there is no obvious justification for it.



## Thatcher gone, but not her influence

Even though her popularity has been slipping during the past year, Margaret Thatcher nonetheless stunned the world last Friday by resigning as prime minister of Great Britain.

Thatcher has been credited with revitalizing England's position in the world during her 11-year reign.

But in the past month, two of her Cabinet members resigned because of differences of opinion with Thatcher. Former cabinet member, Michael Heseltine, has been Thatcher's chief opponent in the Conservative Party leadership.

Although Thatcher expressed reservations about the single European market beginning in 1992, it was the inception of a poll tax that eventually turned up the heat against her.

The tax, which is officially called the "community charge," is uniform for everyone over the age of 18. The rate, set by the municipal government, replaced the more progressive property tax.

Heseltine said he would reform the poll tax by basing it on income, therefore garnering support from the Labor Party, the main opposition to the Conservative Party.

But Heseltine is really more like Thatcher than he will admit. And the biggest change will be more external than internal. Thatcher was a forceful prime minister, and was sometimes rather brash in her approach to England's problems.

Thatcher will be remembered for winning the war in the Falkland Islands against Argentina in 1983, and for siding with former President Ronald Reagan on just about every issue confronting the two countries. She made England a world power again.

Great Britain is better off for having Thatcher as Prime Minister, but in these tense times England needs someone with a little more finesse and a lot less heavy-handed strategies.

Thatcher seemed invincible for most of her term. But nothing lasts forever. Not even Margaret Thatcher.

## LETTERS

### Lip service

Now let me see if I've got this straight:

The University guarantees "free speech" to the CIA to recruit future employees who will commit assassinations and other acts of terrorism in foreign countries. The University does not wish to guarantee free speech to the Stanford University Marching Band because the band's presentation hurt the feelings of some of the spectators.

Furthermore, the University has refused to rent Autzen Stadium to the Grateful Dead, so as not to give the appearance of condoning even a small amount of drug use by a mostly peaceful crowd. But the University is not willing to take any serious steps to stop violence and vandalism by Duck football fans, because the fan's drug of choice — alcohol — is legal. Or is it just that wealthy alumni and their sons can get away with anything?

Could it be that despite all the talk of a "University for everybody," Oregon is still a university for hardly anybody? Could all the lip service to diversity merely be a cover for an

institution that exists only to meet the needs of rich, white, conservative, heterosexual men?

Since I am not a University student or employee, and since I don't even like the Grateful Dead, maybe this state of affairs is not my concern. But as an Oregon taxpayer, I have to say I'm distressed that my money is helping to pay for it.

Betsy Brown  
Eugene

### Be nice

In response to the letter "Flag Flop," (ODE, Nov. 15):

Never mind the old adage "if you can't say something nice...." I think this is more appropriate; if you can't say something intelligent, don't say anything at all!

I didn't realize the the University had such an abundance of marching, colorguard, drill writing and coordination experts. I do feel fortunate however, that these experts can make their opinions known so that the entire community can benefit from their years of experience and invaluable expertise.

Not only is the colorguard

talented and well-rehearsed, but they support the school in a positive way. The colorguard deserves the same support from the school. Oh, by the way, I can't wait to see all the experts at spring tryouts to show everyone how it's done.

Luke Spencer  
Eugene

### All connected

In response to Frank Limbaugh's letter (ODE, Nov. 14):

The University provides an open forum for all ideas — not just the ones you endorse. Censorship does not resolve conflict, it intensifies it.

You stated, "an animal is not an 'individual,' an animal is an animal."

How profound! For your information, an individual is a single thing or being — not a homosapien, as you implied. The question is not, "Can a slug drive a car or can a cat build a 50-story building?" The question is, "can they suffer?" And quite clearly the answer is yes.

Animal rights does not require that non-humans be awarded the right to vote, or freedom of religion. No — it is

much more simple than that. All we ask is that all the inhabitants of the earth be treated with dignity and respect.

"Whatever befalls the beasts of the Earth, befalls the children of the Earth. All things are connected." — Chief Seattle

Todd Hausman  
SETA

### Bad apples

It is ironic how hypocritical the letters to the editor can be. I'll explain my case. It seems in vogue lately to either rip on the greeks for reserving seats, or to backlash at the University for banning the Dead from Autzen Stadium.

I do not condone "seat saving" even though I am one who could benefit from such practices. My friends and I prefer going to the game as a group. I am amazed by the fact that peo-

ple will so readily judge everyone in the greek system based on a select few. That is discrimination at its best. Along this line, I would like to say that in contrast to Jonathan Schildbach's letter (ODE, Nov. 14), I realize that I am out of high school, and that regardless of what Marc Smith (ODE, Nov. 14) might think, I have an identity of my own.

In the same manner, many students are upset that the University banned the Dead because of the isolated incidents involving a few "bad apples." The argument is that the entire group should not be judged by the actions of the few. I agree with this.

These same people then judge the greek system based on a few "bad apples." Wake up and see the hypocrisy.

Jeffrey Chase  
Management/Marketing

### LETTERS POLICY

The Oregon Daily 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.