

oregon daily emerald

Volume 80, No. 80

Eugene, Oregon 97403

Thursday, January 18, 1979



Photo by Doug Williams

Lines like these should be done away with soon, when University dormitories get 96 new pay phones.

Sunday's on the phone to Monday

By KATHY McMANUS
Of the Emerald

The inconvenient telephone service found in most University dormitories is due for an overhaul, representatives of the various halls claim.

Within two weeks, installation of 96 "semi-public" pay phones will begin, says Dick Romm, assistant housing office director.

The plan to put a phone on each floor is the result of the meeting last week attended by University Vice Pres. Ray Hawk, Dorm Governance Committee chair Don Sturgill, Housing Director Philip Barnhart, Romm and four telephone company representatives.

The fight for more phones is based on dorm residents' expectations that they deserve at least a minimum amount of service, Sturgill says, adding that the issue has been brought up several times in the past few years.

With the present set-up, students often don't hear a ringing phone, or if they do, don't answer it because they know they'll have to run up one or more flights of stairs to track someone down, he says, making some incoming calls hard to receive.

But the struggle for better phone service hasn't stopped there.

"The ultimate goal is to get phone ser-

vice in every room at the lowest possible cost or at least have phone service available at the lowest possible cost," Romm says.

Because it would require significant building and wiring modifications, an in-dorm system is not expected to reach the University before the fall of 1980, Romm adds.

The semi-public pay phones to be installed this year differ from public pay phones only in the customer charge — which is \$23 per month instead of \$50 — Romm says.

The University Housing Department will absorb the costs for this year, but will raise the dorm rates \$15 per person next fall.

Romm says he would like to see all of the phones installed by spring vacation, but isn't making any promises. "Realistically, I don't see how they can get 96 phones in by the end of this term," he says. "Our buildings weren't made for these phones — you can't just plug them in."

The process should be completed by the end of spring term, he says.

Installation will begin in Bean Complex, Romm says, because the only off-campus phones now there are on the first floor. Students reside on the second and third floors.

Rideout case questions new Oregon rape law

Analysis by
JENNIFER GREENLEAF
Of the Emerald

As the Rideout saga draws to a close with its "happy" ending, questions linger about the effects of the 1977 Oregon rape law that allowed Greta Rideout to charge her husband with rape while they were married and living together.

Is the government giving married women the protection they need, or is it sticking its nose in somebody else's business?

Only in recent history has rape even been considered a crime against women, instead of a crime against another man's property. In the 17th century a system of fines — paid to the husband — was established for rapes.

This historical notion has been so hard to shake that it seems to operate even today. Gradually, the idea that a woman's body is her own has come forward, culminating in laws resembling the one passed by the Legislature.

Other laws passed concerning rape in the last few years have tried to keep the victim and her past sexual history from being on trial.

The Legislature's purpose in enacting the 1977 revision in the rape law was to close a loophole that didn't allow women not legally separated from their husbands to charge them for rape when they weren't living together.

Rape is defined legally as a male engaging in sexual intercourse with a female by use of force or coercion, or if the female is under age.

In Oregon there are three types of rape which carry maximum prison terms from five to 20 years. First-degree rape, with which John Rideout was charged, is a Class A felony, carrying a maximum sentence of 20 years and a \$2,500 fine.

Some feel that punishment is too serious for a man accused of raping his wife, while others say the law is a good one and needs to stay on the books. Still others say the government has no business regulating people's private lives. And so the question remains: was the legislature ahead of public opinion when it enacted the law?

Cases which involve a husband and wife are difficult. A pattern of abuse and reconciliation, such as that shown by the Rideouts, is not unusual. Prosecutors are reluctant to try cases of domestic violence because they do often end in reconciliation, whatever the reasons.

Pat Horton, Lane County district attor-

ney, calls the law an "inappropriate remedy." Horton says he does not like using the courts to solve problems of domestic violence because the victims often refuse to testify against their husbands.

Horton's office receives about 30 calls concerning domestic violence a month. About four of those cases are filed and about one out of four women will actually testify. Horton supports the efforts of outside agencies to deal with rape and violence.

Bob Larsen of the Lane County Public Defender's office agrees the law is a bad one. As a test case, he feels that the Rideout situation was typical and that it was a good test of the law.

Larsen would like to see such problems handled in the divorce courts and the money spent on trials diverted to funding rape and domestic violence programs.

Although the Rideout case does not set a legal precedent, Larsen said that its outcome would make prosecutors more careful about the cases they choose to prosecute.

Women active in rape prevention disagree with the county lawyers. They feel that the problem of domestic violence is serious enough that women need the protection of the law. Society, they say, has an obligation to protect women from physical assault by anyone, be it husband or stranger. Rape is rape, whether it occurs in the marital bedroom or the street.

But upholding that obligation raises the question of marital consent. Because a woman has said "I do," does that mean she has given up her right to control her body? When consent is given for a period of time, does she have the right to withdraw that consent at any time?

Feminists say that a woman's body is her own, and she has the right to make a decision about whether to have sexual intercourse each time it occurs. Some believe that the marriage contract implies consent, and that a husband should be allowed access to his wife's body at any time.

Many women would like to see another case tried under the 1977 law that would result in conviction to put some force behind the law, because they feel that the Rideout case was not a good test.

Paula Backus, a University Year for Action student who works with raped and battered women at the Family Shelter House, criticized the judge's ruling allowing Greta Rideout's past sexual history as evidence. Other women also objected to her

(Continued on Page 3)

today

It's been a tumultuous year for the Student University Affairs Board, as SUAB chair Gary McMahon will attest. His plan to prod some of the board members into action with a "merit system" salary plan was turned down by the SUAB. See Page 3.

Lane County's new assessor says he's staying out of the headlines, making quiet job performance his major goal in office. Already Bill Bain faces a financial crunch that has forced his office behind in this year's property assessments. See Page 4.

Eugene science fiction novelist Kate Wilhelm says people need fantasy to work out the psychological problems of growing up and adjusting to the world. She says science fiction is the only fiction trying to cope with problems today. See Page 4B.