

PERSPECTIVES

DISCRIMINATION IS DISCRIMINATION

Just because the ROTC is a federal program does not exempt it from adhering the University ideal of tolerance

Just because the ROTC is a federal program does not exempt it from adhering the University ideal of tolerance.

The University is dedicated to the idea of dispelling stereotypes and promoting a tolerant atmosphere in which to learn and grow as students. That is, of course, unless you ask them about the Reserve Officer Training Core, ROTC, and its policies regarding homosexual students.

All students are permitted to take the first two levels of military science classes in the ROTC. But from there students must sign a contract with the military that explicitly forbids homosexual behavior, therefore making it impossible for gays and lesbians to take upper division military science classes at the University.

Somehow this little arrangement is more palatable because, as everyone knows, it is military policy and the University cannot change government policy.

Accepting this discrimination under any circumstances is wrong, especially on a university campus dedicated to promoting tolerance.

It is unclear, however, how much bargaining power the University actually has in the situation. According to H.R. 1530 National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal year 1996, "No funds appropriated or otherwise available to the Department of Defense may be made obligated by contract or by grant (including a grant of funds to be available for student aid) to any institution of higher education that, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, has an anti-ROTC policy."

Anti-ROTC means when a university does not "establish a unit of the Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps."

Whether all federal funding or simply funding associated with the ROTC will be pulled if an in-



stitution is found to be anti-ROTC.

It is unclear if loss of funding as described above is limited to military money or all funding in general. If this amendment includes all funding, the government would take away 92 percent of student financial aid as punishment for not having

a ROTC program.

John Mosley, provost and vice president for academic affairs, was unable to respond to what would happen to federal funding if the University were to discontinue ROTC programs.

In fact the University has done little to investigate the implications of not permitting this discrimination on campus i.e. no longer allowing ROTC on campus.

We want to make one thing clear, we are not endorsing a ban of ROTC on college campuses, but we do think that the discrimination that happens in ROTC needs to be examined.

If the University has not even looked into funding, it is clear that on their end this conflict of ideology is not foremost in their minds; especially when the words government funding appear.

Although this is a federal issue, we need to let administrators know that discrimination is unacceptable and that alternatives need to be explored.

One student in a letter to the editor posed the question of what would happen if the history department suddenly told students that they could only register for a class if they did not act outwardly Jewish, African American or Hispanic?

The University would never tolerate such blatant discrimination, so why do they then allow the ROTC to do it?

This editorial represents the opinion of the Emerald editorial board. Responses may be sent to ode@oregon.uoregon.edu.

QUOTED

"We worked really hard this whole year to reestablish OSPIRG." Geneva Wortman, ASUO president on the recent OSPIRG victory in the general election

"It's good to give out carrots. But a carrot isn't effective if it turns out to be a radish." Barbara Ross (D-Corvallis) referring to cash incentives for higher education institutions to improve in designated areas.

"Yeah. OSPIRG is about as non-partisan as a neutered dog is." Jonathan Collegio, political science major at the University in a guest editorial on OSPIRG.

LETTERS POLICY

The Oregon Daily Emerald will attempt to print all letters containing comments on topics of interest to the University community. Letters must be limited to 250 words. The Emerald reserves the right to edit any letter for length, clarity, grammar, style and libel. Letters may be dropped off at EMU Suite 300.

Letters to the Editor

Indecent proposals

The Lane County Planning Commission recently voted 5-2 to recommend rezoning 40 acres of Ross Bradford's non-impacted forest land near Bear Creek Road east of Creswell to allow him to expand his residential-area private quarry into a large-scale commercial quarry and mine operation.

Supposedly serving the public interest, these five totally ignored the valid objections of more than eighty families living below the butte he plans to blast into gravel for private profit.

Lowered property values? Area wells drying up? Runoff degrading Bear Creek and Wild Creek? Destruction of prime elk habitat and displacement of the herd? Noise, dust, and pollution?

Increased traffic danger to wildlife, pets, children, and residential motorists as heavy gravel trucks-rumble past people's homes every five minutes Monday through Friday from 7:30 a.m. to 5 p.m.? Totally ignored.

Lane County Transportation Planning staff member Lloyd Holtcamp's strong recommendation that this zoning change be denied because of safety issues, road damage

caused by heavy truck traffic, and conflict with the Lane County Transportation Plan? Totally ignored.

The Lane County Board of Commissioners will hold a public hearing on this issue soon. If you agree that the rights of more than 80 homeowners should not be trampled on because of a bizarre process that defies common sense, please contact the county commissioners at 682-4203 and tell them clearly that you oppose this unfair, unnecessary, short-sighted and destructive rezoning decision.

Jerome Garger
Eugene

Column exceptional

I am writing in support of Jason George's column criticizing Rolling Stone's article on Britney Spears (ODE, April 12). The column did an excellent job of pointing out the legal aspects and entanglements that allow that kind of crap to be published.

But what's really sad about Britney Spears is that she is now idolized by countless elementary-age boys and girls who are attracted to and stimulated by her naughty school girl attire and attitude.

Rolling Stone proves this attraction by including a photo of her fans gawking at her from behind a fence; many of them are young girls.

I volunteer at a local elementary school, and it scares me to see her CD cover (with her posing in a sexually suggestive manner) scattered among textbooks, crayons and Where's Waldo? books on a fourth-graders desk.

The girls are likely to grow up thinking that they have to dress and act like Spears, and the boys will grow up thinking that they should. Rolling Stone and other publications, as Jason described, do contribute to sexual stereotypes and misconceptions that result in a society in which thousands of women are raped and thousands of children are molested every year.

Overall, Jason George's column was undoubtedly one of the few high-quality columns to grace the pages of a paper usually flooded with poorly written articles, five pages of sports and the occasional sexist column that makes its own contribution to the aforementioned problem.

Neil Callahan
Pre-education