

EDITORIAL

Students must help prevent tuition hikes

Getting an education used to be about acquiring knowledge in all of its abstract and concrete forms. Students studied subjects ranging from literature and philosophy to quantum mechanics and organic chemistry. Along the way, students are supposed to grow into mature, responsible adults who have the life experience to complement their education.

Since the passage of Measure 5 in 1990, the lessons being taught in higher education in Oregon have all been about money. Specifically, how are the public colleges and universities going to get more of it?

On Friday, July 22, the Oregon State Board of Higher Education approved the 1995-1997 biennial budget proposal, which includes a 9 percent tuition increase for residents, a 3 percent increase for nonresident undergraduates and an 18 percent increase for nonresident graduate students. It also contains a \$50 per term technological resource fee the University will charge beginning this fall.

Student lobbyists called on student leaders from Oregon's schools to say "enough is enough" and demand that Governor Barbara Roberts "put more money into the higher education budget and to earmark that money so that the proposed 9 percent per year tuition increase could be 3 percent per year instead." This is a nice thought, but there is no concrete source for this money, which is predicted to come from taxes and the lottery.

This increase is a slap in the face for resident students who have stuck it out with an Oregon school because they didn't think the state would really sell them down the river. Unfortunately, that is exactly what has happened. But asking the already emaciated state government for money it does not have yet is not going to help.

Neither is blaming the State Board of Higher Education. In light of Measure 5, innovative solutions are few and far between. Right now the board is considering a proposal for using a system of differential tuition (tuition would vary from school to school, dependent upon market forces) and a proposal to turn the whole system into a public corporation.

The issue should not be brought down to a "Give us more money" situation. With so many Oregonians making the same cry, it is doubtful that anyone would hear the students' demands. Students should play a more active role in keeping the cost of a college education down.

If we were not creative people, seeking a better world for ourselves and those who come after us, we would not have embarked on the incredible, albeit bumpy, journey of education.

College years are one of the only times in life when people are allowed to spend a majority of their time just contemplating without creating something concrete. It is possible that somewhere in some public university in Oregon there is a person who is going to develop a cure for AIDS or a person who is going to figure out a way for us to preserve more of our precious natural resources.

If this tuition increase makes you angry, but angry is all you are, and you are not motivated to try to find a better solution, you had better be prepared to get angrier. This is only the beginning. But, if you are truly a student, you will at least try to find a better solution. If you can come up with something better, the President's office is in Johnson Hall.



LETTERS

Zionist fascism

Semper fi: For the U.S. Marines used as cannon fodder during the Israeli retreat from Beirut. Let's avoid the obscuring nature of Zionist hype and consider the real issue: the nature of the Jewish state.

Israel chose the model of a centralized autocratic regime with nationalistic policies, regimented industry, commerce and finance, censorship and suppression of opposition. Webster's defines this as fascism. Similar Western nations were Italy under Mussolini and Germany under Hitler.

The Zionists have likewise pursued an aggressive military policy against the racially and culturally different residents of Palestine. It began as simple terrorism, including the massacre of most of the Palestinians in Deir Yasim in 1947. This coincided with the U.N.-sanctioned division of Palestine into the tillable Jewish section, leaving the Palestinians with Gaza, the underdeveloped heights of Judea and Samaria, and the barren West Bank. The atrocity incited hundreds of thousands of Arabs to flee for safer havens, freeing up yet more real estate for the evergrowing Jewish population.

This caused the problem of the stateless Palestinians, refugees and victims of Zionist occupation tactics. Isn't it obscuring the issue to ignore the Camp David accords? How about the listing for the last eight years of Israel as one of the worst abusers of human rights by Amnesty International? The same eight years of the Intifada "uprising"? All the while the Zionists continue to suck at the pork barrel of U.S. deficit-financed foreign aid. See *The Lobby: Jewish Political Power and American Foreign Policy*, by Edward Tivnan.

Let's not obscure the issue. We fought World War II to wipe out the German and Japanese versions of fascism, but with the PC Israeli brand, we just throw money at it. Semper fi.

Donald Stowman
Eugene

Enlightened

From Stephen Crawford's July 19 commentary (ODE), it would seem he believes certain Judeo-Christian beliefs should be overtly given the weight of law by the U.S. government.

It seems he thinks that only those rights which are "God-given," i.e., that are acceptable to the religious doctrines that he defines as "Christian," should be protected by the Constitution, and that he agrees with the conservative, Reagan appointee justices that lesbian and gay people, making love in the privacy of their own homes, can be made by a state into criminals.

It was the ideas of the enlightenment that served as inspiration for the Constitution. These were ideas that were generally anti-tradition/religious/superstitious in nature.

People were starting to think that they could question their cultural traditions, and look at the world, their societies and their selves as they actually are, rather than as tradition says that they are supposed to be — and that they could think about these things rationally.

Where the law succeeds, it succeeds because it does this — it tries to look at the world as it actually is. And where it fails, it seems to fail because it comes from people's preconceptions, dogmatic belief systems, misunderstandings, greed, or political expediency.

The Constitution is a great document because it was based on the idea that if you could see the world as it is, and think well about it, you could make a better society. It is great because it broke with tradition, and proposed new, bold ideas, not because it was based on any particular religious doctrine.

It went beyond the majority, Christian mores of the time, which allowed for such things as the genocide of Native Americans, slavery, child abuse, witch burnings, and the exclusion of women from political and economic power, and it told people that there can be a place where they can speak, think, and live without fear of oppression. It continues to say this, to

everyone.

Ben Iglauer
Computer and
Information Science

Freedom

Open letter to Stephen Crawford (ODE, July 19):

I certainly hope you do not preach philosophy like you preach history. The framers of the Constitution did indeed have religion in mind; that is why they definitely state the separation of church and state and why the three sections of our government — legislative, judicial and executive — exist.

They realized that in the heat of passion crowds can vote for the moment and so the other branches can rein in discrimination and mob rule. This country was founded by people, who were escaping the turmoil of repression in the Old World and fleeing here to begin a new endeavor of personal freedom.

The majority does rule in most cases except when it tries to run over the individual rights of others. I am sure the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church agree that to distort the context of documents is despicable but they must change and correct past injustices (civil rights, woman's suffrage and the abolition of slavery).

Any attempt to force a particular narrow religious viewpoint on others through the establishment of "law" is theocratic, not democratic. You have the right to believe in and practice your religion, but you do not have any right to pass any judgment or infringement upon my right to practice and believe something different.

If you think homosexuality is a sin, then do not do it. I doubt that you are without sin, and therefore can cast the first stone.

I think you will find that the laws of America go back to Greek, Roman, English and Judean law, not Christian. You should rediscover history and philosophy. Remember, religious freedom is freedom of — and from — religion.

James Dean Poyner
Eugene

Oregon Daily Emerald

P.O. BOX 1155 EUGENE, OREGON 97403

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published daily Monday through Friday during the school year and Tuesday and Thursday during the summer by the Oregon Daily Emerald Publishing Co. Inc., at the University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

The Emerald operates independently of the University with offices at Suite 300 of the Erb Memorial Union and is a member of the Associated Press.

The Emerald is private property. The unlawful removal or use of papers is prosecutable by law.

Editor: Kaly Soto

Associate Editors: Meg Dedolph, Lia Saliccia, David Thom

Photo Editor: Michael Shindler

Night Editor: David Thom

General Manager: Judy Riedl

Advertising Director: Mark Walter Production Manager: Michele Ross

Advertising: Brian Davis, Subir Dutta, Tony Fox, Jeff Marion, Michael Millette

Classified: Becky Merchant, Manager

Business: Kathy Carbone, Supervisor Distribution: John Long, Ferenc Rakoczi

Production: Dee McCobb, Production Coordinator: Tara Gaultney

Newsroom 346-5511 Display Advertising 346-3712

Business Office 346-5512 Classified Advertising 346-4343