

Helping the library help students

The library is among the first elements of a University to suffer when administrators and accountants realize their debits and credits aren't going to meet at the bottom line.

University officials have done their damndest to lessen the damage to our already underfunded library. And the physical education department has sponsored fund-raisers.

But its easy to cancel periodicals. And cut back on new books.

When the damage is done to a library, the wound — like a fist in the gut — is invisible. The pain is inside, felt but not seen.

Visitors see nothing missing, nothing cut. They don't see the thousands of books waiting to be cataloged and shelved, the latest research findings that can't be purchased.

University Librarian George Shipman has done a good job stretching his funds. He's reorganized the library, and is adding a new cataloging system. But when the money stops coming, a

library stops growing — stops getting better.

A library not increasing its resources becomes an archive, useful only to historians. A stagnant library is like no library at all.

It's an insidious loss. No vociferous factions invade Johnson Hall. No group marches through Eugene. No picket-packers parade.

Yet we all suffer. There are few students who don't depend on the library. But as important as

OURS

the library is for students, there is no student-supported, student-organized group to help preserve this University's library.

Which brings us to our point. We'd like to see a student-controlled group — a "Friends of the Library" — charged with working for students to maintain a solid library.

It could be an ASUO-appointed volunteer

committee, operating on student funds from the Incidental Fee Committee, returning to students a library yield on their investment.

The group could work for the library much like, say, the Survival Center works for the environment. They could give conferences, provide information and sponsor fund-raisers. A giant "save the library" bash highlighted by an Autzen Stadium concert could bring in lots of bucks. It's likely that a ban on outdoor concerts will be lifted in time for summer.

The idea is worth kicking around as an alternative to those who propose giving IFC money directly to the library — a practice we oppose. We don't want the IFC distributing operating funds for University facilities, let alone department and schools.

A University is only as strong as its weakest link. We can't afford to see the library — or the University — weakened any further.

YOURS

TV room transients

Recently an article appeared in the Emerald on problems with transients in the EMU TV room. It was suggested that two solutions would be to (1) close the TV room, and (2) require everyone to pass through the Fishbowl before they entered the TV room. Neither is valid!

I have pursued the matter legally and since the EMU is a public building, nothing can be done unless the transients create a disturbance or assault someone. They would then be barred from campus. While I have no solution at this time, I will be searching for some means to alleviate the problem in the future. All ideas from readers on the subject would be welcome. There are many reasons for some form of control in this area. One is the danger of verbal and physical abuse which has already occurred. The second is the inability of some students to use the TV room because of the repugnant odor emanating from the person of some transients. We all have an investment in the quality of campus life and activities. Will the EMU become another Eugene Mission? Will students be exposed to constant pan-handling from transients? Will our TV room, paid for by student IFC funds be taken over by outsiders? Only you can address the problem through student government and public awareness.

Robert Barzee
Masters Candidate, education

Runaway IFC

The runaway IFC has struck again. On Tuesday night it voted to cut the University childcare center's budget from

\$74,000 to \$18,000 and to make the financial aid office responsible for distributing \$50,000 in childcare subsidies to eligible student parents. The parents can use these grants at any local childcare center.

The committee made this decision despite the EMU Board's rejection of the plan and nearly two hours of testimony from student parents who opposed the plan.

What is the IFC trying to do? It claims to be ending discrimination against parents who don't use the University's childcare centers. In reality, it has taken a giant step toward destroying the University's already struggling daycare program. By adding another level of bureaucratic involvement (You know what applying for financial aid is like. Will parents have to apply in March for grants to be used the following September? How much will it cost to process applications? Will the cost come from the \$50,000?), the IFC will increase the cost of childcare. And instead of funding the state and federally licensed childcare centers on campus, the IFC will be handing out money with no control over the quality of the care on which it is spent.

Jon Neiderbach cited a Children's Services Division study which showed that only 22 percent of University parents use the campus childcare. I wonder what percentage of University parents have school-age children who don't need care, Jon. Or what percentage of parents would use the centers if they weren't already operating at capacity. Instead of spreading the money around in wasteful little bits so that no one gets quite enough, perhaps the IFC should be looking for ways to expand the childcare system we have on campus so that more people

can use it.

As a result of Tuesday night's decision, the University's daycare centers will be wounded, perhaps mortally. Student parents, who barely scrape by now, will be hurt. But ultimately, it is the children who will suffer the most when their parents are forced to seek out cheaper, lower quality childcare.

Linda Audrain and co-signers
Law Parents Task Force

Mindless tirades

Socialism rears its ugly head again in the form of Cathi Beavers' April 22 letter. Beavers likes to make a big point of coming from a working-class background. I've yet to see anything though about her putting in 10 hours a day, six days a week, on a green-chain, with the sweat rolling off her body, the dirt clogging her pores, and the blood bursting through her skin from dragging sheets of veneer across her belly and arms. I haven't seen Beavers mention anything about standing on her feet 16 hours a day on a sweaty, sticky job while a foreman constantly badgers her for more production. Have you experienced any of these things Beavers? I have.

Until you can show me you know anything about what I have experienced personally, then I'll just chalk your empty tirades up to another mindless student, bent on tearing down the system that provides me a way out after 14 years in these sweat boxes.

You see, Beavers, I believe in the American system. I've seen too many people rise above their past to not believe. If I had the space, I could cite you countless instances where people have risen out of a poor, impoverished

background to positions of wealth and influence. Just to name one local case, a man who is the second highest ranking executive in the mill I now work for comes from a background that was even more impoverished than mine. He went through a childhood of near starvation and deprivation. Today, due to hard work and determination, he holds a position near the top rung of our society.

Tell me, Beavers, what other form of government gives a person the means to accomplish this? Is it socialism, where everyone begins as equals and stays that way continually? Get off your high horse Beavers! What kind of life is that where there would be no incentives to accomplish anything more than to just get by. Our system rewards those with the guts and determination to make something of themselves. As for the rest, such as yourself, well you can go along with your little echoes of protest and criticism while the rest of us will work to pay the taxes that go to support your kind. After all, somebody has to support you. That's what being a democracy is all about. Even the slothful get fed.

Jerry L. Peyton
Senior, finance

Sexual concerns

I am writing this letter for whomever may be concerned with sexual inadequacy in our society. I think in a lot of cases there are women who disrespect men and also think that men are no more than a meal ticket and economic security. The economy of today is responsible for prostitution and maybe for the homosexuality in today's world. This is because it is an easy way of making easy money without working.

I think that men compete for masculinity against other men. For this reason, women take advantage over men for sexual and economic security. I also think that men should not have to compete for their manhood. I think that economic security and love affairs contribute to homosexuality. Women through the ages have learned that they can take advantage over men for sexual reason; which in turn the men will supply their needs.

I think that what I have written above should be closely examined by some humane organizations, because it is a very disturbing problem.

I think that prostitution should be dealt with as a man who would rape a woman and get sent to prison. Women who are into prostitution should get tried for their criminal standing in our society for taking advantage of the men who allowed themselves.

GOD BLESS AMERICA!

Stanford Brown
Eugene musician

