

Ridiculous prohibition

The University, as a landlord, may come in conflict with federal and state laws forbidding discrimination based on marital status. The family housing division of the University Housing Department refuses to rent to unmarried student couples.

The lessening in the last few years of the social stigma attached to unmarried couples living together and the passage of legislation to prevent discrimination in renting to these couples has combined to make the University's position very difficult to defend.

The idea of universities and colleges providing for married students has its roots in the post-WWII and Korean War period. The influx of students starting or returning to school strained the existing housing situation. In those days, the majority of the housing available—dorms and social organizations—was geared to single students. These returning GI's were older and in many cases married. The housing market for them was restricted. Recognizing the situation, the federal and many state governments allocated funds for the construction of housing specifically set aside for these types of students.

In the intervening years, the situation at the University and most schools has changed. Increasing demand by single students as well as married students for an alternative to dorms and social organizations expanded the off-campus housing market. Granted the market is tight, it has still increased several times since the period from the late '40's to the early '60's.

These factors, an increase in alternative housing off-campus and a decrease in the number of returning GI's, make the University's policy of maintaining separate housing for married students obsolete.

The family housing division does use other standards for deciding who gets the housing. Students whose income makes them eligible for student aid have priority over students with higher income. Class standing also affects the priority. Higher priorities are assigned in descending order to teaching fellows, graduate students and seniors, on down to freshmen.

While these criteria may be commendable, the prohibition against unmarried couples is ridiculous. The housing office plans to ask the state Attorney General for a ruling on the restriction. Regardless of the ruling, the University should move to comply with the spirit of the law that forbids discrimination and drop the marriage requirement for couples to obtain University housing.

Letters

Everyone served

I commend Pres. Boyd on his change of position concerning faculty evaluation access. It is a positive step in the best direction: good student-administration relations. But it is only one small issue.

It would serve everyone if Boyd would meet with the students and attempt to reach a compromise on the many other issues that have recently been raised; the control of Mac Court being one. This would do nothing but good in insuring that every problem is settled out of court and to the satisfaction of everyone.

To not do this will hurt everyone and the University. Who wants to attend a school where there are nothing but problems? To avoid this let's make sure that all problems are handled on campus by the concerned parties. Compromise is not dishonorable and can only be in the best interests of everyone.

Michael A. Stepka
Recreation and
Park management

up to the fact that God is no longer coach of the Bruins, and they are indeed vulnerable. But even that could not change me. What finally did it was the game Saturday night. There were lots of empty seats. When UCLA scored, the people clapped their hands. And the only fans they had were a bunch of rich middle-aged old ladies with fur coats and diamond rings who were pulling their husbands along by the nose. When UCLA was down by 20 with five minutes to go, the fans walked out in hoards. That would never happen at Mac Court.

Yes, Dick Harter, you've performed a miracle here at the UO. Now, if you could get Ron Lee back for another year and do something about this lousy rain, you could start a new religion. Now then, would anyone out there care to donate a ticket to the Washington game Thursday night so this new convert could get a real look at the Ducks in action?

Tom DeWolf
Junior
NW Christian College

Errant reasoning

Monday's Feb. 23 article by Becky Brown was one of the most simple-minded and distressing articles I have yet read. She uses terribly archaic and errant reasoning to feed the insatiable Duck ego.

Miracle converts

I've been converted. I never thought it would happen. Having been a loyal UCLA fan for 21 years, this comes as a traumatic experience. But I've finally faced



'SEE? HE'S REALLY QUITE TAME...'

opinion

Movement risks credibility

The English language cannot be taken literally 100 per cent of the time.

When my roommate said she just lost her head over a guy, I didn't rush out to help her find it. When a friend said, "Guess who I bumped into yesterday?" I didn't quickly scan him for cuts and bruises. When my dad looked at my car and said I got a real lemon, I didn't offer him a slice.

Likewise, when I say, "Mankind is facing extinction," I am not excluding women from this fate. And when I attend a meeting and see that the chair "man" is a woman, I don't presume she is just filling in for the real chair "man" while he copes with the flu or attends his father's funeral.

I am outraged and somewhat embarrassed by the off-shoot of the Woman's Movement which is trying to reform the English language.

I am outraged, first, because I have enough difficulties communicating major ideas without having to consciously assess every word that I'm using to convey those ideas. And, secondly, our language is awkward enough without throwing in more stumbling blocks like "s/he" (How do you pronounce it?). Our language is drab enough without taking away some of our historical "spine-tinglers" like, "mankind," "countrymen," "fellow man," etc.

I am embarrassed because the Woman's Movement, whose ideas I can largely support, is risking its credibility by projecting sexism where no sexism exists. I am embarrassed because, being a supporter of the movement's major philosophy, I am also expected to support this incredible snipe hunt. I am outraged because, last

week, two of my professors had to waste valuable class time to defend their usage of the English language. Moreover, I am concerned because I see current and would-be advocates of the basic movement being alienated by this side issue.

Sexism lies in the person who uses the word, not in the word itself. The word is merely a symbol, a reflection of the speaker. Educate the speaker and the words will follow suit. Erase sexism in the mind and you automatically erase sexism in the word without having to change the word itself. "Mankind," to the non-sexist, becomes figurative and translates to mean, all of the people of the world. But to the sexist, it means only the male population—even if the term used in "person-kind."

Let's stick with reforming the people instead of the language. We Oregonians know we can't keep it from raining just by using suntan lotion. And we can't keep our society from being sexist just by eliminating sexist words. Instead of eliminating words, let's expand them with our new awareness. Let's leave the physical qualities of the word intact as a reminder of how far we've come.

When I was a kid, I made lots of snow "men." Some of them were moms, some were dads and some were lions.

Those who still find themselves threatened by a mere word must remember this application of an old joke: "First of all, you have to be smarter than the word."

Jeanine Holly
English

Her reference to the location of Pauley Pavilion is irrelevant and her dubbing the audience "rich" is erroneous. The old "spoiled little rich kids" is what I find her inference to be. There is no more credibility in that statement than in declaring the UO basketball audience to be rural hicks.

Furthermore, her praise of the contingent of Duck fans present at the game in Los Angeles was ridiculous. Obviously the Duck fans stayed the duration of the game—obviously they would have greeted the team afterwards regardless of the outcome. After all, that group was the fanatical, "rich" Duck fans who could afford to run around following the team.

Unfortunately, Ms. Brown failed to note the clean appearance of Pauley Pavilion and the absence of pernicious "audience participation" during the game. Apparently UCLA fans are just too spoiled and spiritless to interrupt their games with frisbees and debris. Too bad you didn't take a nice big bag of garbage along Ms. Brown, you could have given them all a demonstration of just what that good ol' Oregon spirit is.

Michael Schmidt
undeclared, fr.

Inference valid

As reported by the *Emerald*, approximately one-hundred people attended Monday's rally in protest of the proposed tuition increase. Does this number of the University's students constitute a quorum? Or would it be fair to infer that the vast majority of students realize that the one painful reality of society that can't be escaped even at the University is that "there ain't no such thing as a free lunch?" I feel that the inference is valid.

Chris Ellingson
Eugene

Role expands

I was pleased to read Don Robb's article on S.W. OMSI in the Feb. 19 issue of the *Emerald*. S.W. OMSI exists to serve the community, and encourages input from the community—feedback, suggestions, comments or questions. In the expanding role the organization is playing, there is also a need for all types of contributed help, especially voluntary resource people in the areas of art and science.

I did note an error in the article, however. It was a misunderstanding.

ing. S.W. OMSI will sell any non-restricted chemical to anyone. To buy a restricted chemical, one must be over 21 years of age and sign a chemical release form.

Many thanks to the *Emerald* and to Don Robb for a well-written article communicating the enthusiasm felt by the staff and volunteers—people who are working together toward a common goal, in a growing, evolving community organization.

Mikal Anderson
S.W. OMSI Science Sales Store

Letters policy

The *Emerald* will accept and try to print all letters containing fair comment on ideas and topics of concern or interest to the University community. Because of space limitations, letters must be no more than 200 words, typed triple-spaced, dated and signed with the person's major. No unsigned letters will be published. Longer opinion columns will be published whenever possible after being submitted to the editorial page editor. The limit on opinion columns is 800 words, using the same format as letters.

Wednesday, February 25, 1976