



greg wasson

tabled indefinitely

January brings political developments on the national scene depressing enough to make good Lane County liberals quake in their down booties. In fact, most have spent so much time lamenting the inauguration of Ronald Reagan that they haven't taken time to cheer the passing of probably the worst thing to happen to the county in recent history: Archie Weinstein.

Self-ordained as the biggest of the little guys, Weinstein has been a highly vocal example of the philosophy and approach that threatens to ensure that Lane County will repeat the mistakes of its Californian and East Coast neighbors.

And as to the notion that Weinstein gives a shit about the little guy — hogwash. Weinstein's decisions and efforts in the courthouse have been aimed at helping not the little people, but the people like him who have lots of money. Consider his drive to open large tracts of land north of Eugene to industrial development.

The area in question is a 1,800 acre parcel that lies between the urban growth boundaries of Eugene and Junction City. The pre-1979 Commission ruled that the spacious fields and sheep pastures remain in agricultural use. However, when Weinstein's Warriors became the majority, they set about changing that. Oblivious to the drive to keep the urban area contained rather than allowing it to gobble up the surrounding land, Archie and the boys did their best to clear the way for unfettered development.

One wonders if such an effort benefits the small farmer and home owner in the county, or if it allows others to make enormous profits at their expense.

And what about efforts to create jobs while dealing with the Lane waste problem by creating an ongoing recycling project rather than building enormous high-tech operations? The people ad-

vocating such programs are at the end of the income scale that Archie says he was looking out for. Yet, rather than help them, he resisted them.

Oh, I forgot. Archie didn't like their hairstyles or the fact that they patched their jeans rather than throw them away. They were, gasp, hippies. Hippies wanting to work with the government. Can't trust 'em. Guess legitimate little guys don't wear ponytails. Besides, Sen. Joseph McCarthy proved that you can direct attention away from your own excesses by creating fear and suspicion of others.

But, that's unfair. Maybe Archie didn't need to direct attention away from himself but is just a mean, vicious person. At any rate, Lane County is rid of him, and unless he makes good on his threats to run for governor, no longer has to worry about trying to neutralize him.

yours

More on feminism

At the risk of perpetuating an argument, I feel I must reply to Ms. Lorraine ("Feminists Will Win", Jan. 12).

In her letter, she was very upset at the "little fellows" who have argued for their right to view pornographic films, especially the "Story of O," on campus. She also defined what a feminist is for those of us who read her letter. For that alone, we should all be eternally grateful. I found that I was wrong when I assumed that a feminist was someone who supported everyone's freedom of choice concerning lifestyle, for once regardless of a person's sex.

I did notice, though, that she and all the feminists who have objected to pornography on campus have forgotten one segment of the population who were present at the film in question. Namely, the women who went to the film of their own volition. I was one of those women. I was not brainwashed, coerced or dragged to it. In fact, I suggested going. Some feminists I know do not believe that simply because I went with a man. It's kind of like having religious freedom in Puritan Massachusetts. It's only allowed if your religion is the same as theirs. As the same holds true for these feminists, no wonder they are so easily confused with fundamentalists.

Ms. Lorraine doesn't seem interested in people working together as equals, nor do I think she wants unoppressed

women thinking for themselves. She's simply offering her services as a substitute slave-master.

Marcia Stysma
Sophomore, Chemistry

King's birthday

Buried in the middle of last Monday's Emerald, next to a small news item entitled "Rape Occurs in University Residence Hall," was an article with the headline, "Group wants King holiday." If the Emerald's response on Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s birthday is characteristic of the mood on campus and around the country, no such holiday or national commemoration is likely. Not one word about Dr. King appeared in the Emerald on his birthday, although the rape story glared at readers from the front page as it had done the previous two days.

Naturally we all feel the immediacy of the violent threat to our daily lives which rape represents, particularly when it occurs on campus, in the one place where a student should expect to be safe. But rape is an expression of hostility and a symbol of injustice very close to those forces which Dr. King fought all his adult life.

In his struggle for human dignity and freedom, Martin Luther King awakened the nation's conscience and mobilized a generation. Now, when we daily witness a resurgence of the forces of hatred — in the renewed vitality of the Ku Klux Klan, sniper shootings of blacks, a national

epidemic of rape, and the kidnapping and murder of black children in Atlanta — we need to be reminded of Dr. King's mission and of his martyrdom. Although the Emerald cannot be expected to function as an advocate for social causes, at least by the standards of objective journalism, it might have judged Dr. King's birthday worthy of some brief mention when there are visible efforts on campus this week to bring it to the community's attention.

Louise Westling
Honors College

Two-faced attitudes

Discrimination is not the only problem facing feminists. The women's movement is also hampered by the two-faced attitudes of supposedly liberated men.

Bob Johnson's Jan. 14 letter is a study in hypocrisy. Although he claims to be in favor of equality of the sexes, he persists in keeping many of the values of the typical male chauvinist.

Even though he apparently believes that the "personal value and importance of someone is independent of sex," the qualities he values in women are "big tits, a tight ass and bubble-headed giggles." He values intelligence "occasionally," no doubt when it is accompanied by the required bust and derriere measurements.

He also criticizes the women's movement for its rejection of passivity.

Agreed, passivity is not necessarily a negative quality. However, what Johnson fails to realize is that passivity is a part of the traditional female stereotype, and as this outdated view is rejected, passivity is disowned also. Johnson claims to support equality, yet at the same time he wants women to keep the stereotype of meekness and passivity. The two images are incompatible since passivity invokes domination, the opposite of equality. Although meekness may have its charms (especially for the domineering side of men), its positive aspects must be sacrificed so that its negative connotations do not appear. If women are to attain equality, some degree of aggressiveness is necessary.

Furthermore, he censures feminists for having "frustrated minds." How he expects women to avoid frustration when even supposed believers in equality judge women by their attributes is unclear.

Johnson asks, "What does the statement 'feminists will win' mean anyway?" and asserts that it implies someone will lose something. Should the day come when feminists win, the only things that will be lost are discriminating attitudes and actions. Feminists are not fighting to make men the losers, but to make everyone winners. This end cannot come about unless Johnson's type of hypocrisy is eliminated.

Peg Maris
Freshman, pre-journalism

Plea to bikers

This letter is a plea to all the bicyclists out there, especially those who ride in the early morning and/or at dusk or dark. Please light up! This fog is making it just about impossible for a driver to see an unlit object more than a few feet in front of the car. This problem is magnified at night when the cars' headlights bounce off the fog and the windows are constantly fogging and condensing. Please, even if you only carry a flashlight, carry or wear something which will differentiate you from the unseen; reflectors, reflective tape, bright clothing and as many lights as you have.

I also hope that (sober) drivers are acutely aware of the limitations of their visual range in this weather. If the drivers are defensive and the bicyclists as well as the animal owners, parents of small children and walkers who also take special precautions, maybe fewer will get hurt.

Constance M. Toomey
2577 Harris
Eugene

Monday, January 19, 1981

