

# COMMENTARY

Editor in Chief:  
 Michael J. Kleckner  
 Managing Editor:  
 Jessica Richelderfer  
 Editorial Editors:  
 Salena De La Cruz, Pat Payne

Tuesday, October 8, 2002

## Editorial

### U.S. must give Iraq time, option to comply with U.N. resolutions

War is never the preferred solution to international disputes, and it isn't the right answer now for the situation with Iraq.

For the past 12 years, Iraq has been under the terms of an armistice that halted the Persian Gulf War. At the time, U.N. resolutions ordered the destruction of Saddam Hussein's nuclear, biological and chemical weapons capability. Since 1991, Hussein has repeatedly hampered the inspectors from doing their work, and in 1998, he threw the inspectors out altogether.

There are some in President George W. Bush's administration who are very eager to send the U.S. military into Iraq immediately and be done with Hussein once and for all. Congress is close to giving Bush the unfettered ability to attack Iraq at will. Bush himself made a national speech Monday evening laying out his case for unilateral U.S. action. Nothing Bush said, however, was new or surprising.

We do not argue with the fact that Hussein is unfit to rule a nation, but it is not the responsibility of the United States to force Iraq to comply with U.N. sanctions. Worse, to do so would undermine U.N. authority and destabilize the region, threatening America's security.

Instead, the best suggestion would be to take the compromise proffered by France of a two-stage resolution in the U.N. Security Council. The first stage would demand complete disarmament and inspections to force compliance.

The United Nations should unequivocally tell Hussein that inspectors must be allowed in any place, at any time, under any circumstances and with no warning, until the world is convinced that Iraq no longer has weapons of mass destruction. There should also be a trigger for a second resolution that would enumerate the consequences of renewed stonewalling.

One of the benefits of this method is that it gives Hussein enough rope to hang himself. On the one hand, if he complies and disarms to the satisfaction of the United Nations, so much the better. Everyone would win — the world could avoid war, Hussein's power would be preserved and the sanctions would end.

However, should Hussein once again deny inspectors access or try to impede their work, the world would have clear "causum belli" — reason for conflict. The Security Council can then authorize U.N. forces to militarily disarm Hussein.

Should military action come, the aim of any attack must be the same as the aim of the resolutions: Disarmament first, regime change a distant second, if at all. It is only in the case of extreme resistance to inspectors' entry that the international community should consider removing Hussein from power by force.

The deal currently being hammered out between Iraq and U.N. weapons inspectors must be allowed a chance to work, and the United Nations itself must be allowed to enforce its own resolutions. If the United States acts unilaterally, it will undermine its own security and the force of international law that it relies on when demanding that the United Nations act against Iraq.

#### Editorial policy

This editorial represents the opinion of the Emerald editorial board. Responses can be sent to letters@dailyemerald.com. Letters to the editor and guest commentaries are encouraged. Letters are limited to 250 words and guest commentaries to 550 words. Authors are limited to one submission per calendar month. Submission must include phone number and address for verification. The Emerald reserves the right to edit for space, grammar and style.

## A familiar battle cry

The headline was outrageous: "U.S. details Iraqi missile fire" (The Oregonian, Sept. 30). Iraq shooting missiles at American aircrafts patrolling the no-fly zone? Those pesky Iraqi citizens trying to shoot our brave American soldiers out of the sky? What nerve! Who do they think they are?

For some reason, I don't buy it. The story made me immediately think of two things. The first is a movie, "Wag the Dog." The second occurred in 1964 and was named the Gulf of Tonkin incident.

"Wag the Dog" is a movie starring Robert De Niro as the president trying to convince the American public that they are at war in Albania when, in fact, there is no such war. De Niro and his aides hire top Hollywood producers, directors and actors to star in "war footage," which is then distributed to news organizations who then broadcast to a dismayed American public.

In the end, the American people are never the wiser, the president wins re-election and all is well at the White House.

About 38 years ago, President Lyndon B. Johnson announced to a shocked public that Vietnamese torpedo boats had launched an "unprovoked attack" against a U.S. destroyer on "routine patrol" in the Tonkin Gulf.

The story said that North Vietnamese PT boats "deliberately attacked" a pair of U.S. ships. Not long after, Johnson announced air strikes against North Vietnam, a huge escalation of the war.

In truth, the "routine patrol" was not routine, but rather a coordinated maneuver that aligned the United States with the South Vietnamese Navy and the Laotian Air Force. Years later, the truth came out and America discovered that Tonkin did not happen as the Presi-

dent said it had. The story was manufactured to draw America into a war that the White House had already mapped out.

As of a few days ago, the White House released never-before-seen footage of U.S. planes being fired at in Iraq. The tapes show a two-missile battery swiveling in a circle, then launching a missile at the pilotless spy plane which was shooting the video. The tapes were once confidential but now, for some odd reason, are available for the voting public to see.

The question here is: Why? Why did the government decide to suddenly publish this new, previously classified information? The most likely reason is to give the Bush administration all of the support it needs to declare war and bomb the hell out of Saddam Hussein's Iraq.

Since Iraq is now actually firing at United States aircraft, potentially endangering American citizens, isn't that cause for war? That's exactly what President Bush wants the American public to think.

On Wednesday, Bush reached an agreement with House leaders authorizing him to use force against Iraq. The agreement read, "The president is authorized to use the armed forces of the United States as he determines to be necessary and appropriate in order to defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq." (The Oregonian, Oct. 3).



Kate Petersen  
 In other words



President Bush may be authorized to use military force as he sees fit? What a scary thought. I hope Congress is scared, too.

One part Gulf of Tonkin, one part Wag the Dog? I truly hope not, but something makes me think that the folks in charge of running America are not above this kind of action. Bush wants to declare war so bad he can taste it, and this may just be the event that will give him the consensus to do it.

Trust the government? Not me. Hollywood shows that this kind of thing is more than possible, and history shows it has been done before.

E-mail columnist Kathryn Petersen at kathrynpetersen@dailyemerald.com. Her opinions do not necessarily reflect those of the Emerald.

## Frohnmayer's dry frat policy is a riot

### Guest commentary

In spring 2002, University President Dave Frohnmayer, along with key members of the administration, finalized a resolution to force fraternities at the University to implement substance-free housing. With news of this mandate came a flurry of student frustration and public dismay over what seemed a grotesque abuse of power.

What bothered me, however, wasn't the administration's blatant infringement of civil liberties. Nor was it the surprising discrimination against the Greek community, a population whose alumni contribute roughly 60 percent of the University's financial donations. What really struck me about Frohnmayer's decision was the inherent blindness with which it addressed the issues of student conduct, safety and alcohol abuse. Under pressure to react to a nationally growing problem of student misbehavior on college campuses, Frohnmayer's position on "dry" fraternities has paradoxically fueled the fire he was trying to put out.

Anyone who went to college or goes to

college, or has even the vaguest concept of life in a university setting, can agree that students are going to party occasionally. To pretend that student nightlife, drinking, and experimentation are problems that need to desist is to deny the very essence of a young adult coming of age. Further, to force fraternities to be substance-free in an effort to enhance student safety and health is the veritable equivalent of sticking one's head into a bag so as not to face the real world.

In a fraternity, there exists a great amount of personal liability on the part of its residents. If something goes wrong, if an accident happens, if fun turns into trouble — then members of the fraternity will find themselves in court. This accountability forces these men to take personal responsibility for both themselves and all those in their house. A tightly controlled hierarchy of officials, including a president and risk management officer, take charge within fraternities to ensure the security of all attendees. In turn, gatherings at these houses are always closely monitored and relatively safe.

This is not the case when students are pushed into neighborhoods surrounding the campus. In this environment, substance

abuse, violence and pandemonium spring up on busy nights. Overcrowded house parties become beacons for police activity, fights, rapes, DULs, riots, and there was even a shooting last year. There is little control and almost no personal liability. Frohnmayer undeniably knew this and yet persisted in making fraternities go "dry," essentially forcing even more students to find their good time in quiet residential neighborhoods.

The result of this decision was easily predictable, and as they say, the proof is in the pudding. I was wondering how long it would take for disorder and property damage to begin occurring in the streets around the University. It ended up only taking two days. Friday's riot and ensuing police action is just the beginning of what this year will bring.

As a student, I suppose I will just sit back and watch. But if you're a local resident, a parent or Eugene police officer, I will say this: In your moment of frustration, be sure to call Frohnmayer and thank him for his ignorant disregard for student safety and community civility.

Dan Occhipinti is a sophomore philosophy and political science major.

### Letter to the editor

#### Police approach to riots overzealous

First of all, I resent as a student that the blame for this event has been put all on our shoulders. I understand that this was drunken kids that started these riots and that they absolutely got out of hand, but let's think about who allowed them to get out of hand — the

police! I honestly believe that the Eugene police get off on tear-gassing crowds of people.

This is my second year at the University and I have seen this twice now. I am originally from New York, where people are much crazier than these Oregon wannabes. I have never in my life seen anything get so out of control. Fortunately, I was not a part of this. At 2 a.m., tear gas was the only option, but at 11:30 p.m. when the "riot" began, those measures were definitely not necessary and should have been handled in

a civilized manner at that time.

P.S. 1. Gas was not poured on the golf cart, but there was a gas leak in the cart's fuel tank. 2. News reports across the country stated that the fires were on the "campus." What's that about? 3. Instead of just mentioning coughing and tearing, how about you mention the extreme vomiting that every tear gas victim suffers with?

Katherine Vogeler  
 junior journalism