

COMMENTARY

Newsroom: (541) 346-5511
Room 300, Erb Memorial Union
P.O. Box 3159, Eugene, OR 97403
E-mail: editor@dailyemerald.com
Online Edition:
www.dailyemerald.com

Editor in Chief:
Jessica Blanchard
Managing Editor:
Michael J. Kleckner
Editorial Editor:
Julie Lauderbaugh
Assistant Editorial Editor:
Jacquelyn Lewis

Tuesday, November 6, 2001

Editorial

ASUO should create a safe-haven for all

Over the years, Project Saferide has been criticized for its women-only driving and riding policy. The federal Office of Civil Rights recently found the program in violation of Title IX, and University President Dave Frohnmayer recently signed an agreement to be in compliance with the law by March 29, 2002. Title IX is a 1972 federal law that does not allow discrimination based on sex in University programs that receive federal financial assistance, and ironically, it was created to help women gain equality in sports and academic programs.

Saferide must address this violation of Title IX. The program has a few options: The University could establish a separate program just for men. Saferide could move to coed vans, or the program could add to its current service an additional van driven by men for male riders only. We favor the latter. Adding male-only vans to Saferide would make the program in compliance with the law, and it wouldn't establish an additional program, which could be potentially troublesome if construed as "separate but equal." Additionally, men on campus would have an opportunity to ride safely as their female counterparts have done for years.

We're glad Saferide exists. Creating a shuttle service for those who feel unsafe is both noble and supportive of women taking a stand against potential violence. However, there are many men who do not feel safe on campus, and they have the right to enjoy the same benefits as women.

We do, however, believe in women-only vans. The vans should remain segregated because the purpose of the program is to offer women an alternative to walking alone at night and risking sexual assault; allowing men in the van could counteract Saferide's efforts by removing the women-only space that makes riders feel protected.

The University should be commended for promising to find a solution to the discrimination by spring. Creating a shuttle strictly for men as a subsidiary of Saferide is the best option if the project wants to continue to use federal funds. The project should recognize men are vulnerable to sexual assault and violence, just like women.

Make your voice heard about Saferide in the Emerald's online poll. Visit www.dailyemerald.com to vote.



Steve Baggs Emerald

End homegrown terrorism

We are now embroiled, so the president says, in a war against terror. While I believe we must put an end to Osama bin Laden and his al-Qaeda organization, now is also the time to put an end to a war we thought finished in 1945. We have home-



Pat Payne
Columnist

grown, neo-Nazi groups here in this country. Given their history, we should declare neo-Nazi groups as inherently terrorist organizations and act accordingly and aggressively, as we would with al-Qaeda.

By focusing laser-tight on bin Laden, we could be ignoring the possibility that the recent anthrax attacks may have been a "copycat" effort meant to draw attention off the tail of a homegrown terrorist. It's worrying that through lax security in this country, through their own ingenuity (it's dangerous to think of them all as merely moonshinin' rednecks), or through an al-Qaeda "friend," some of

these neo-Nazi groups could find access to biological or chemical weaponry.

We have seen how these so-called "militia" groups and those aligning themselves with neo-Nazism and the Klan have committed terrorist acts in this country and have no compunction to use violent means to further their goals.

In 1964, four young girls were killed in Birmingham, Ala., when their church was dynamited by Ku Klux Klan members. Other bombings in the area during that period, instigated by the Klan, earned the city the grim nickname "Bombingham."

In 1995, Timothy McVeigh, associated with white-supremacist and anti-government groups, detonated a bomb next to the Alfred Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City. More than 165 people, including a large number of children, died in the explosion.

In 1998, Eric Rudolph injured or killed more than 150 people in bombing attacks around the south, including an abortion clinic in Birmingham, a gay bar in Atlanta and the 1998 Olympics in Atlanta. He was later found to have ties to white-supremacist groups. What if, instead of bombs, Rudolph were running around with anthrax?

It is a documented fact that numerous

white supremacist groups applauded the Sept. 11 attacks, including the so-called Posse Comitatus of Pennsylvania and the National Alliance. Other groups, such as many in the "militia" movement, have conspired to overthrow what they refer to as the "Zionist Occupied Government" — the United States government — through any means necessary should an opportunity arise.

All this should be proof enough that groups aligning themselves with neo-Nazism or neo-fascism can be considered terrorists. We can use U.N. Security Council Resolution 1373 against them as much as against al-Qaeda. Deny them money. Freeze their bank accounts. Freeze any attempts at financing their terror campaigns on American soil. We need to deny these homegrown terrorists a base here from which to launch their own dreams of racial jihad.

We have to hunt down and stop Osama bin Laden. However, this is also the time to finally put an end to a similar, yet older terror. It's time we finished the job we began so long ago.

Pat Payne is a columnist for the Oregon Daily Emerald. His views do not necessarily reflect those of the Emerald. He can be reached at patpayne@dailyemerald.com.

Poll Results

Every week, the Emerald prints the results of our online poll and the poll question for next week. The poll can be accessed from the main page of our Web site, www.dailyemerald.com. We encourage you to send us feedback about the poll questions and results.

Last week's poll question:
How are you changing your holiday travel plans because of terrorism?

Results: 47 total votes

Taking the train —
1 vote, or 2.1 percent

Staying home —
11 votes, or 23.4 percent

Hitchhiking —
5 votes, or 10.6 percent

Keeping plans the same —
27 votes, or 57.4 percent

Renting a car —
0 votes, or 0 percent

Taking the bus —
1 vote, or 2.1 percent

Don't know/Haven't thought about it —
2 votes, or 4.3 percent

Fortunately, the threat of terrorism is not changing the travel plans of most of our voters.

Fear of the unknown should not deter Americans from normal travel.

This week's poll question:
How should the University deal with the Project Saferide lawsuit settlement?

The choices:

Make Saferide vans coed

Make separate male Saferide vans

Make a separate program for males

Keep it the way it is

Don't know

CORRECTION

In Monday's Emerald, the election deadline was incorrect. Ballots can be dropped off until 8 p.m. Tuesday. The Emerald regrets the error.

U.S. military must retaliate to lessen chance of repeated terrorist attacks

GUEST COMMENTARY

Josh Brown

As with most, if not all, of the 6 billion people populating the Earth, one of my great hopes is that all of the people inhabiting this planet can live in peace, no matter gender, religion, race, whatever. I believe even Osama bin Laden and his followers desire world peace at some level.

However, in the eyes of bin Laden and his followers it somehow happened that Americans encompass all they hold to be evil. They have believed this to the point where bin Laden has demanded all true followers of the Nation of Islam to join the fight against the Jews, Christians and Americans.

The history of our relationship with the Middle East to this point bears little importance now. What needs to be addressed is: How do we deal with the situation we are in now? While peace would obviously be the most desirable option, to think it possible at this stage would be ignoring the facts.

The terrorists' actions on Sept. 11

were not an extended hand of peace, nor a final point meant to make all previous disagreements simply water under the bridge or to make everything even. The attack against America was intended as just that — an action made with full intentions of escalating America and the Middle East's relationship to a full-scale war.

Our only choice is military retaliation. The terrorists never had intentions of attacking on Sept. 11 and then stopping; their goal is to eliminate America, and those attacks are simply the first phase. You don't do something as horrific as those events without plans of war.

Not attacking and "turning the other cheek," so to say, would not quench the

terrorists' thirst to destroy America and its beliefs. It would not stop the terrorists from planning future attacks; they are willingly executing efforts to begin a full-scale war. If America didn't retaliate with military force, America's collective consciousness of safety would sour, and we would turn into a country hoping for peace and cooperation, but living in fear.

The bottom line is America needs to counterattack because there is no other answer. No matter what America does, bin Laden and his supporters are still going to attack. It is horrible to know that we still live in a society where our only option is to eliminate the threat from existence, but that is the sad truth America must face.

The lives lost on Sept. 11 can never be returned, but with proper action, the possibility of it being duplicated can be lessened.

Josh Brown is a junior majoring in sociology.