

Absurdity

Does pornography lead to heroin?

By LEE SIEGEL

This past summer's Supreme Court decision on obscene and pornographic literature, film, and live "theater" discarded the previous criterion of "redeeming social value" for judging questionable material, and in its place substituted what can only be called censorship on a local level by whatever rednecks, self-righteous moralists, or squeamish liberals happen to have nothing better to do.

Indeed, since the ruling, ambitious district attorneys all over the country have raised the holy flag of decency and mounted a crusade against the satanistic infidels who dare to corrupt the nation by giving its citizens the free choice of a broad spectrum of unnatural sex acts to watch, read, or slobber over.

SO WITH THE official sanction and blessing of the high court, the indignant crusaders have mounted their high horses and gone galloping off with their schlock troops of blue uniformed knights to sack the dirty book stores of America, and to purge theaters of any movie that offends the good taste and high moral values of any American who happens to be offended by something no one forces him to see.

While the white tide of decency seems to be overwhelming the nation, there

are some who are getting fed up with all this nauseating decency and namby-pamby, mealy mouthed morality, and have launched an organization to combat the devious assault on their constitutional right to watch Congress when they feel like it.

"After all," says Loren Looselice, president of the Society for More Unreadable Trash (SMUT), "some guys come home after a hard day at the office and unwind by having a beer, but many people prefer curling up in the old recliner with a good filthy book to get their minds off their jobs."

SMUT SEEMS TO BE gaining support nationwide. Mrs. Hadine Crudway, a prim housewife from Horsedung, Iowa, and a new member of SMUT says that she agrees with the basic aims of the organization. "The court's ruling poses a serious threat to civil liberties, and can certainly be considered an infringement upon my constitutional rights," says Mrs. Crudway, "besides, I just loved seeing 'Deep Throat'."

The two foci of the debate that is raging between the pro-and-con-SMUT forces are the questions of the constitutionality of the court's decision, and the theory that pornography leads to sex crime.

First, the anti-obscenity forces released a conclusive study in which a Minneapolis businessman, after being exposed to dirty movies for 72 con-

secutive hours, went on a rampage during which he raped the projectionist, a hitchhiker, a Sunday school teacher, and his pet pomeranian.

Then, on the counterattack, SMUT released a study which showed how an American president, after being exposed to a so-called clean movie, "Patton," rated "G", went on a killing spree that left over twenty thousand Cambodians either dead, wounded, or homeless.

BECAUSE OF THE conflicting evidence, the debate was deadlocked. Until recently, that is.

In a new study, published last week by the New York Theological Institute of Seminal Studies, the findings lead to the conclusion that the use of pornographic materials on a regular basis leads to the abuse of heroin. In a related study it was found that the daily use of marijuana has a causal relationship to the frequency with which one performs unspeakable acts.

The study was based on three years of careful observations of the effects of exposure to Playboy centerfolds on two groups of rats. The control group was composed of normal males, while the second group consisted of gelded rats subsequently injected with powerful hormones and allowed to eat as many Hostess cupcakes as they wanted for a three week period.

AFTER SEVERAL WEEKS of ex-

posure to photos of naked rat breasts and privates, and to recordings of the sounds rats make while engaging in sex (something like "ra-toot-sie-ra-toot-sie"), five of the rats started smoking marijuana, ten began to mainline smack, and the remaining 230 committed a grisly suicide by smashing their tiny rodent skulls into their Hartz Mountain water bottles.

SMUT is not taking the results of the study lying down, however. Looselice insists that the rats were brainwashed by schizophrenic nuns before the study, and that as a result the whole thing is invalid. Investigators from the federal Food and Drug Administration have been unable to uncover the truth, but available evidence does seem to indicate that the study was less than reputable.

SO THE BATTLE rages on. Citizens for decency and mental sanitation wage a war of extermination upon filth, crud, scum, and all vile, evil corruption in whatever dark corners it is found, trying to their utmost to catch those men in trenchcoats who accost pure little school children and ask "Hey kid! Wanna see some dirty pictures?"

And meanwhile those panderers to the prurient interest, the patrons of pornography fight for precious survival, rallying around their motto: "Give me liberty or give me SMUT!" Siegel is an Emerald staff writer.

Viewpoint

Election next week

Students must recall Leo and Barnett

(Note: The following article was written by the Eugene Coalition Liberation Support Movement. For further information call Tony Gregg or Mike Goldstein at 343-3282.)

We leave it to Greg Leo to talk about how "it will be a drag to get out of office now...it would be insulting to get recalled...my integrity is in question..." etc. The fact is that what Leo calls controversy is corruption. Leo deserves to be kicked out of office not as an effect of the heavy handed policy of Nixon but for his own acts. Leo is not what he is only because he belongs to the same party, the Republicans, but because of his own heavy handed policy which we will prove now.

Last year the campus was aware as was Leo of the controversy between the ASUO and the Foreign Student Organization. The previous administration (Wyatt-Loveys) unjustly and unconstitutionally invalidated the election of the FSO and froze their budget. This was not done as a result of investigation or discovery but only to satisfy the racist Fred Loveys after the FSO tried to implement the ASUO Senate resolution that gave the FSO 50 per cent input for the International Education Center. The FSO had also asked for a representative on the Executive council and got it. Loveys refused to implement these decisions. After the FSO election in which Loveys ran and lost miserably for president some complaints were manufactured by Loveys' clique. Leo couldn't find anyone to investigate the claims except the racist Loveys. Despite strong objection by the FSO to Loveys, Leo stood by his choice. Loveys tried persistently to invalidate the election he lost but his feeble list of "charges" was rebutted point by point by the FSO. The only thing that Leo and Loveys accomplished was to disable and demoralize the FSO and to totally discredit themselves and to unveil their reactionary racist priorities and their illegal strong arm tactics. This is a common pattern. Note daycare. Note the suspension of the IFC. Note the freezing of the Native

American Student Union funds. All this from Leo, who claims to be "responsive" to students.

Last spring Leo was responsible for a \$15,000 raise in the ASUO allocation to the Athletic Department. In the same deal he agreed to allow the AD to further rip off the students through combination tickets. The result is that most students see a huge chunk of their incidental fee money go to

the AD and yet the majority of students cannot gain admittance to sports events.

Leo stated: "They (members of the Coalition who started the recall) don't really have grounds for recall." If not this, then what constitutes grounds for recall, Mr. Leo?

At the same time, you could find no money for daycare. Just who are you serving? Leo had another chance when the

AD announced in early November that it had taken in considerably more than the estimated revenues for ticket sales. There is every reason that this money should be returned to the ASUO for reallocation. Leo by his silence stood with all those such as Nixon, Reagan, Clark and Bogen against the best interests of the students. Now the students must speak and act strongly to recall Leo and Barnett on Monday.

Letters

Attitude degrading

A contribution to the recall controversy (Nov. 20, p. 5, col. 1) includes a passing remark which nevertheless calls for strong dissent. The author refers to students who "have trouble finding any job other than menial bussing" — italics mine. If the complaint was directed at low wages it might be unobjectionable but the writer evidently regards this sort of work as essentially degrading, regardless of the compensation.

The writer, it seems, is a foreign student and his attitude may be due to an unfortunate background, but this view of necessary and useful labor has in recent years become increasingly common even among native-born Americans. More and more students regard as beneath their dignity any employment more physically grueling than sitting behind a desk "coordinating" some mysterious "project." Were it suggested that they should attach themselves productively to the handle of a broom or shovel they might not actually faint but would certainly consider themselves grossly insulted. But what is really insulting is the writer's toploftily categorizing as "menial" a type of labor which some of the less dainty students do not find it beneath them to undertake. I suppose that when in the EMU dining room I actually "bus" my own dishes I should feel degraded.

I worked myself through several years of undergraduate and graduate work as a construction-gang worker, farm laborer, and odd-jobs man; my jobs included

cleaning out stables and chicken houses and "re-cycling" the product. I did not enjoy this work and it certainly was not well-paid but I did not and do not regard it as "menial." A younger brother paid for his meals through four years of college by washing dishes. One wonders that either of us has been able to hold up his head since.

Kenneth Wiggins Porter
Professor Emeritus of History

Blackmail?

Your editorial entitled "Arab blackmail: Let them eat oil!" of October 22, 1973 defines Arab oil embargo as blackmail. In 1966, the United States Government cut off food to Egypt. The step was taken as a result of a political conflict.

The Arab oil-producing states feel that they must impress upon the American Government and people the fact that hundreds of millions of dollars, generated by the United States economy which is fueled partly by Arab oil, are helping perpetuate Israeli expansion and occupation of Arab territories, as well as the denial of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

Ibrahim Tawasha
Director
Arab League Office
Western Region, San Francisco

Note: The Emerald of Oct. 22 ran the article described above clearly marked commentary and by-lined with the author's name. The views expressed in the article were not necessarily those of the Emerald.

Childish politics

Childish politics seems to be part and parcel of some University of Oregon politicians who search for issues in order to get their names in the paper. The attempt to impeach Greg Leo and Debby Barnett seems to be a continuation of the tradition of such childishness.

As a University student working in a Senatorial office in Washington, D.C., I see close at hand issues that University students could well be involving themselves in. The impeachment of Richard Nixon, attempts to mitigate the energy crisis, a last ditch effort to save French Pete, ground-work for the important political campaigns to be held later this year and a variety of other issues that either indirectly or directly affect student welfare are issues that could use student help.

While I have not been in complete agreement with everything Greg and Debby have done and with some of their priorities, it seems incredulous to me that students have to search for "relevant" issues. Did it strike the students who are asking for Leo and Barnett's impeachment that it would be fun to "play" impeachment after having the idea suggested to them by national efforts to impeach Nixon? It would seem so.

Students employed in the effort to impeach Leo and Barnett might better spend their time trying to solve some serious problems than engaging in petty political hay-making.

Michael Dotten
Senior, political science