

Whose job is the University's image?

Just who is responsible for the image of the University?

A series of articles on the University's image-makers that concludes in today's news pages doesn't give a satisfactory answer. Each administrator, faculty and staff member and student has a different perspective.

And some condemn the Emerald — and other student-oriented groups — for not carefully cultivating a positive image for the University. But most University students and administrators realize that a student newspaper isn't — and shouldn't be — an arm of the public relations department.

The Emerald gives its own, independent view of campus events. That means news that's both

good and bad — news that maybe the University's image-makers would rather we'd ignore.

That's the job of any paper. "The press" is far from perfect, but it shares that general commitment.

University administrators are paid hefty salaries to defend the school, take flak, smooth

not a facade but a scrim, a carefully constructed gauze through which the University is viewed. They accentuate the positive and minimize the negative.

It's the students' job to do what they like — accentuate, minimize or remain neutral. The duty of a University is to serve students, not to ask students to serve the University.

Like a magician, the University's administrators must often distract the eye with a well-timed sleight of hand — to tell the public to look at the good and not at the controversy.

That's *their* job. And that's okay. But students, and student newspapers, occasionally will tear that gauze and accentuate what administrators would rather minimize.

That's okay, too. Because that's our job.

OURS

rough spots and handle oft-heated complaints. And that's their job.

It's a mistake to assume that others — the student newspaper or other students — share the same responsibilities. The administration creates

YOURS

Any better plans?

Former Rep. Bill Rogers of Vida recently wrote to this space, urging students to write their senator in Salem regarding House Bill 2001, the reapportionment plan. Rogers stated, correctly, that newly-created House District 38 is a grotesque and politically nonsensical district, stretching as it does from Pleasant Hill in Lane County to Canby in Clackamas County, with little but hills in between. It is undoubtedly the worst district to come out of the legally mandated reapportionment process, and I, too, hope that it can be changed without upsetting the delicate population balance now obtaining in the urbanized areas of the county.

The problem with reshaping legislative districts, which must be done after each census, is that districts must be of equal population, within very narrow tolerances. This session, the House leadership in both parties decided that the line formed by the crest of the Cascades was to be politically inviolate, i.e., no district would cross the mountains to include people on both sides. This sensible idea spawned the monstrosity known as District 38, by forcing all of the Willamette Valley districts to "sag" to the south in order to absorb some of the population increases in the Rogue Valley. When the existing Lane County districts, notably District 44, had to move to the south, the people who lived in northern 44 had to be put somewhere.

The original version of HB 2001 put the Pleasant Hill, McKenzie Valley and Marcola voters into District 37, which also included Halsey, Sweet Home and Harrisburg. That plan was dropped in order to appease Rep. Liz VanLeeuwen, R-Halsey, who didn't want all those Lane County voters in her district. It was easy to dump those voters into newly-created District 38 because it has no incumbent to complain about the tortuous boundaries the district has.

Rep. Peggy Jolin, D-Cottage Grove, is understandably upset that many people who are currently her constituents will be unloaded into this pseudo-district for reasons of political convenience.

Anyone who can think of a better plan should follow Bill Rogers' advice and write to their senator.

Alan Contreras

Sweeney swell

I think James Gill is a spoil sport — that is, I like Dave Sweeney's approach to weather reporting. There are many important aspects of our society that require a serious perspective, but I feel life is much too short to maintain this serious frame of mind about every single aspect of our lives. Live a little, laugh a lot, let yourself be silly once in a while.

Page 4 Section A



What does it hurt? Dave isn't gearing his report to "the intellect of mentally inept fourth graders," he is simply being silly, brightening his life as well as ours. If you're offended by this just change the channel.

While I'm on the subject of silly, let me share with you some resolutions of a 90-year-old spoil sport: If I had my life to live over again, I would:

- * Not get such good grades, except by accident.
- * Go barefoot more often.
- * Dare to make more mistakes next time.
- * Play hooky more.
- * Have more actual troubles and fewer imaginary ones.
- * Pick more daisies.
- * Be sillier than I have been this trip.

You see, I've been one of those people who live sensibly and sanely hour after hour, day after day.

Mike Edwards
Senior, physics

Malcontents

Well, I knew it wouldn't be long before the Revolutionary Communist Youth Brigade got its opportunistic hands into the "Support Bobby Sands" movement. After all, what terrorist group do they not support? Their praise for the murdering saboteurs of the Mid-East — the PLO — is unending, even though Israel is the best

defense that region has against further Soviet advances. Their high words of approval for the violence and terror caused by the IRA is equally limitless. I sincerely wonder whether these "communists" support "communism" or just "terrorism."

Had the RCYB checked the facts of the matter, they would have seen that the law of Northern Ireland requires a majority vote at a plebiscite calling for British withdrawal before the British could leave. Such referendums have been held and in each one the pro-British position has won overwhelming majorities. It seems that the RCYB is not interested in the rights of the majority, just in the rights of a violent and illegal minority.

The Prime Minister of Great Britain, Margaret Thatcher, is doing what is necessary to combat the disastrous socialist policies of past British governments. In her campaign she never said that the fight would be pleasant, but the long-term benefits from fiscal sanity and economic freedom will be well worth whatever discomfort the British are going through at this time. Mrs. Thatcher is a great world leader and her domestic and international policies are in the best interests of the British people as well as all people who cherish peace, freedom and prosperity.

One last point, the RCYB claims to hate the "Soviet Capitalists" as much as

they hate the U.S. and every representative government. And yet, when was the last time they had a rally supporting the liberation of the enslaved Afghans? When was the last time they marched to protest Soviet imperialism in eastern Europe? The only conclusion I can reach is, whatever their motives (and they're highly suspect), they are nothing more than chronic malcontents who can offer no workable plan for change, but still call for a revolution. Let's just hope that the American people continue to see through this group which supports international terrorism and opposes all democratically elected government.

Mike Rumble
Junior, political science

letters policy

Letters are limited to 250 words, and each must be signed and the author's field of study or faculty-staff status noted. Letters should be dated, and must include the author's address and phone number for verification. The Emerald reserves the right to edit any letter for length, style or content.