

Let's all lobby

In something of a reversal of roles, a group of University faculty members appear to be taking a lesson from students.

During a University Senate meeting last week, Economics Prof. James Tattersall exhorted his professorial colleagues to support the creation of a full-time supporter of educators' interests in Salem.

He was referring to a campaign endorsed in October by Oregon chapters of the American Association of University Professors to sponsor a legislative lobbyist after the fashion of the Oregon Student Lobby.

The probable creation of a statewide faculty lobby could come as a mixed blessing for students.

While many areas of common interest — research and equipment support, staff expansion and library resources — exist between students and their professors, others may not prove to be so compatible. The AAUP mentioned, for instance, topics of faculty evaluation and tenure policies where student and educators' interests may well be at odds.

Matters such as salaries and fringe benefits also represent a potential for conflict over allocation of higher education's budgetary pie.

Hopefully, the reciprocal interests of providing and receiving a sound education will lead student lobbyists and any future professorial counterparts to make common cause in obtaining financial support for the state's colleges and universities.



"WE HAVE SOME HIGHLY INCONVENIENT NEWS..."

yours

Rape: Violence, not sex

The Rideout case has raised some questions about the nature of rape and, in particular, about the intelligibility and viability of the concept of marital rape.

Philip Kelley, one of the attorneys for the defense, argued at one point that the charges against his client should be dismissed on the ground that marital privilege rules out the very possibility of rape. The misconceptions embodied in this way of thinking are frightening.

Besides picturing women as property which, once ownership is duly conferred and documented, can be used or abused as deemed fit by the legal owner, the disparagement of the concept of marital rape involves a much too common confusion about what rape is.

Rape is apparently still regarded as essentially a sexual act; a rapist as essentially someone who is satisfying instinctual sexual needs and who differs from a seducer only in that the rapist uses force rather than manipulation.

On the other hand, it is generally acknowledged that rape does involve some form of violence: There is a rape victim who is forced to have sexual intercourse, threatened, beaten and sometimes killed by the rapist. Yet rape is still thought of as essentially a sexual act (albeit one performed with varying degrees of violence), because, it is argued, a rape cannot take place unless some form of sexual intercourse occurs.

To argue that there can be no rape without sexual intercourse is like arguing that there can be no stabbing without a knife or no flogging without a whip. Although the weapon involved in each act of violence is different and it is the type of weapon used which gives each act of violence its particular name, the choice of weapon does not alter the fact that each act is nonetheless an act of violence.

It is true that acts of violence can be distinguished from one another by the weapons used or by the means by which the act was performed. It is also true that there can be no stabbing *per se* without some sort of knife and that there can be no rape *per se* without some form of sexual intercourse.

However, an essential characteristic of an act of violence — be it rape, flogging or murder — is the physical and psychological pain caused and the injury, harm and indignity suffered. The fact that violence and harm are actually done does not depend on what type of weapon is used.

Violence can be wrought a myriad of ways. An act of violence continues to be an act of violence regardless of the weapon or means employed.

Herein lies the persistent misconception I have alluded to. Rape is not a sexual act performed violently. It is an act of violence performed sexually. This distinction is fundamental and must be kept before our minds, if we are ever to rid ourselves of the notion that rape is merely a socially unacceptable form of what is otherwise normal sexual aggressiveness or a healthy mating instinct.

If the law recognizes the possibility and inhumanity of spouse abuse and child abuse, the law must also recognize the possibility and inhumanity of marital rape, if the law is to be self-consistent and just.

Richard Zucker
P.O. Box 3020
Eugene, Or

Don't ignore debate

Do fellow students there share our concern at OSU that actions affecting freedom for centuries are taken at Washington, D.C., and even applauded on some campuses without any review or analysis by independent experts?

Sponsored "free" trips to mainland China paid by the present regime have seduced students and faculty to return with glowing accounts of life under the communist PRC. Such propaganda seldom if ever gets faced with facts about the more prosperous life in freedom for Chinese people in Taiwan under the Republic of China.

Numerous older students selected after indoctrination by the mainland regime of Mao and successors will arrive soon on our campuses. Will we take their stories at face value, or will we know the issues and facts so that worthwhile dialogue can ensue for freedom?

Has our campus lecture series included even one independent expert on China policy? You could select from a number of American professors having real expertise on the Far East and quite able to discuss the consequences for us college students of Pres. Carter's unilateral abrogation of the U.S. treaty with the Republic of China.

Will fellow students demand an appear-

ance on their campuses by an independent American expert on China, or will the campus lectures ignore the issues of the controversy over the proposed treaty-breaking by Carter, the "great debate of 1979?"

Daniel S. Molner
senior, mech. engr.
Oregon State University

Shah's 'appalling reading'

In view of the political situation in Iran, and the imminent danger that Shah Reza Pahlavi will abscond from Tehran to live a life of regal splendor in exile, an article in the recent (Jan. 25) issue of The New York Review of Books is timely.

The article, "Guest of the Shah" by Christopher Matthews, is an interview with a British subject who spent 30 months in an Iranian prison. The account of barbarous treatment, torture, beatings, rape and corruption makes appalling reading.

It should serve as another bit of evidence in what will hopefully be an international indictment of one of the 20th century's foremost despots.

Richard Ludescher
graduate, chemistry

