

Neil Bush does not deserve another try

In the wake of the Gulf crisis, other domestic issues have been forced to take a back seat. One of those issues that no longer gets an abundance of press coverage is the Savings and Loan scandal, and more importantly, the involvement of the President's son, Neil.

Savings and Loan regulators have accused Bush of failing to adequately inform fellow Silverado savings directors of his business ties with developers who invested in Bush's oil exploration company. The developers eventually defaulted on more than \$132 million in loans from Silverado.

Silverado's collapse in December 1988 is expected to cost taxpayers \$1 billion.

Administrative Law Judge Daniel J. Davidson agreed with regulators that Bush was guilty of a conflict of interest and that his actions were evidence of "personal dishonesty."

But Bush's career as a director of banking institutions is not over yet. The judge recommended that Bush be allowed to accept a future position with a savings and loan institution as long as he can demonstrate that he can recognize the existence of actual and potential conflicts of interests and respond to them appropriately.

Did Judge Davidson consider that maybe Bush did recognize a conflict of interest and his "appropriate response" was to try to make as much money as possible off the deal?

This new form of punishment — as long as you know what you did wrong we'll give you another chance — should be implemented throughout society.

Murderers who can prove they know killing others is illegal should be set free to try again. After all, if they weren't able to recognize that the person they shot, stabbed or strangled was going to die, how can we hold them responsible?

And why not put Bloods and Crips in charge of pharmacies if they can distinguish between legal and illegal drugs. Society is so quick to condemn these youths when their gang related activities could have been intended as a fun way to kill time.

Neil Bush knew what he was doing when he loaned money to men who were investing in a company he owned. If he didn't, why did he purchase a luxury home under his wife's name — where it cannot be confiscated to pay possible fines?

It is time for the justice system to start treating white color criminals with the same lack of compassion now reserved for perpetrators of small time crimes.



Keep the pentagon out of the editing room

On Monday, the Pentagon released new guidelines for reporters in the military press pool in the Persian Gulf.

Among those rules was a controversial requirement that journalists submit their war coverage to military review.

This is not acceptable under any circumstances. Most news organizations have complained, saying they favor the policy that was used during the Vietnam War where journalists were trusted to follow the guidelines. If any publication or journalist did not follow the guidelines, that person's credentials would be revoked.

That is the best way for the military to ensure that information that would jeopardize the operation, endanger friendly forces or be of use to the enemy does not get out. Americans trust the lives of their loved ones to the military, so the military should have to put a little trust in the media which acts as a communication link for the public.

With the threat of having credentials taken away, reporters and editors will act re-

sponsibly.

That is the best deal that the military should hope for.

Pentagon spokesman, Pete Williams, said the military had no intention of censoring the dissemination of information. But that attitude could change once the prior review policy is in place. The possibility that reporters will begin to hear things like, "you can't print that, and we can't tell you why," is likely.

It is common sense that you don't let an organization that has a vested interest in what the public knows make decisions about what information gets out.

Nobody found out about the My Lai massacre in Vietnam until a soldier came forward and told the story. It was not reported by the government. If the military was allowed the right of prior restraint during the Vietnam War it is possible that we might still think we won.

The military should stick to fighting wars and let the press report on them.

LETTERS

Confusion

Editor's note: Due to a misprint in Carla Moser's letter (ODE, Jan. 9) we have reprinted the first paragraph.

In answer to Jane Stricker's response (ODE, Dec. 6) to my letter (ODE, Nov. 29), I would say, Yes, Jane, Starhawk's lecture did raise questions and confusion about a number of things. On the history issue, suffice it to say that quoting history with a slant toward legitimizing particular goals is a widespread practice, and Starhawk is no exception with her Earth-centered political activist agenda. The issue of truth remains an open question.

Oil bowl

Iraq: 20, USA: 3. First quarter: Iraq dominated their aggressive offense, and plowed through the defense, scoring two touchdowns. USA immediately placed in their special team on defense, called "Desert Shield Defensive Squad," and seemed to slow down the "Iraq Attack." Responding to the aggression, USA moved the ball

to midfield. And on third down they threw the long bomb. Look at this. Iraq stands right behind the receiver and snatches the ball right out of his hands on the 10 yard line, running 90 yards for another touchdown. This does not look like the USA's game. Luckily the kick was blocked, keeping Iraq's score at 20.

Second quarter began and on the first play, flags were thrown everywhere, and USA was taken back 10 yards. From there, they plowed up the field, throwing powerful shotgun passes. Now, look at this the referees started arguing, and then Coach Bush and Coach Hussein yelled across the field at each other. Bush told us earlier that he didn't want violent battle, and Hussein stated that he just wanted to regain old ground. And look at this, one of the players hands Bush his helmet, telling him to play the game. The USA finally gained a field goal, and Iraq complained that the referees were on USA's side. You know Iraq is just playing USA's game, and I don't think the USA realizes that yet.

Look at how many people are in the Iraqi stands, there are thousands up there behind them. I think it's overpacked! And now look at USA — nobody's there; that's pitiful! USA always is waiting to play but no one wants them to. I'd just end the game now if I were the coach.

Well, I'll have to say, this is going to be a long game. It's just like life, life is a long game, and you can't win everything.

David Mattison
PPPM

No voice

The residents of Riley Hall were shocked when, on Nov. 28, we were informed that Eric Lund had been placed on suspension by the University Housing Authorities. We feel that Lund has been an exemplary resident assistant, both in his method of enforcing the rules in a non-hostile manner, and his rendering of advice during our hall AD meetings.

He works with the residents often as an adviser, frequently

taking his personal time to discuss problems incoming freshman and transfer students face in adjusting to university life. While this may seem to be the standard duties of an R.A., it should be noted that not all R.A.'s perform these duties. Eric is respected by the Riley residents. He does not threaten us with sanctions, and he treats us as equals and friends. Eric respects our rights as residents, and we respect his duties as an R.A.

On Nov. 30, we were informed that Eric had been fired. We were not informed of the circumstances surrounding this action, nor were we given any opportunity to voice our satisfaction with Eric's job performance before he was fired. We should have had some say in this matter.

The housing authorities have kept us in the dark. Even now most of us have little or no clue as to why he was fired. We want to know how the housing authority can pretend to reach an unbiased judgment against someone in the space of three days?

The housing authorities have concentrated into their hands the legislative, judicial and executive powers. U.S. citizens have the right to trial by jury. Why are residents of the residence halls denied the same fundamental American right? Surely twelve residents can be found who could render an unbiased verdict on Eric's case (and for that matter any other case involving alleged violations of the student conduct code).

What we have between the residents and the Housing Authority is a failure to communicate. We are entitled to greater representation in the housing system. A certain portion of our room and board funds are used to pay the salaries of the housing personnel (including R.A.'s, R.D.'s and students managers, etc.). We should have a voice in what housing does. Patrick Henry once said, "Taxation without representation is tyranny!" And that is where it stands now.

Peter Mack and 28 other Riley Hall residents

Thursday, January 10, 1991