

opinion

A round of congrats to Hotchkiss, IFC

A hearty round of congratulations are in order for ASUO Pres. Mary Hotchkiss, the Incidental Fee Committee and the Eugene law firm of Goldstein and Campbell, all of whom are involved in the South Africa divestiture case against the State Board of Higher Education.

The dedication and tenacity of these people and groups is admirable. The issue of the State Board's investment in South Africa would have been forgotten and hence, unresolved.

Hotchkiss' administration is to be commended for its renewed vigor in pursuing the divestiture case. Previous ASUO administration all but ignored the ongoing case.

The IFC deserves contratulations for hearing Hotchkiss testimony in favor of continued financial support to the law firm handling the case. The IFC, in years before, voted \$1,000 toward fees and costs in the case. By a unanimous vote the IFC voted \$1,500 for legal fees and \$500 to the law firm to pursue the case.

The divestiture suit won initial victories, but then became bogged down in a protracted legal struggle. That's where the suit lies, mired in litigational swamps. The IFC support through funding could pull the suit out of the bogs.

The most deserving of kudos is the law firm of James Campbell and Michael Goldstein. These two attorneys have pursued the divestiture case since the beginning without great regard toward fees or prestige.

Attorneys with a social consciousness are rare and deserving of congratulations. Goldstein and Campbell believe the ASUO's divestiture case is important not so much as cause for the State Board to withdraw its investments in the government of South Africa (with its policy of apartheid), but for the precedent it will set for other states.

The \$2,000 the IFC agreed to fund Campbell and Goldstein is really not even close to the amount of out-of-pocket money and time the law firm has already devoted to the case. The firm's research and expense to bring the case to trial far outweigh the IFC stipend.

The divestiture case is six years old. Six years of initial victories and then a legal war of attrition. Perhaps the combined efforts of a vigorous ASUO, a supportive IFC and a pair of socially responsible lawyers will bring a resolution of the case and end the State Board's investment in — and tacit support of — the racist and militaristic government of South Africa.

letters

Perpetuation

The *Emerald* headline "Campus 'Candy Store' Creates Crisis" in the Nov. 16 edition is an infuriating example of the pervasive "blaming the victim" consciousness which has contributed to the perpetration of violent attacks on women. By accepting the rapists' classification of the female population of a campus as a "candy store," the *Emerald* has, in effect, sanctioned that classification.

The article emphasized the woman's responsibility and culpability in rape rather than putting the blame where it belongs — on the rapist.

Certainly women should take measures to protect themselves. However, as long as women are encouraged to view themselves as victims, so will the rapists.

Women are not "candy." They are individuals possessing human dignity. The *Emerald* ignores this fact by printing the rudely offensive comic "Oliver," thus complacently accepting the objec-

tification of women. The column last week by the student who had so much trouble getting a date with a "girl" makes one wonder if perhaps he viewed females over the age of 18 as women, he might have better luck.

It is not the "candy store," the fact that women walk and breathe on the campus, that creates the crisis. It is the continued objectification and exploitation of women by society; it is the propagated perception of women as victims by the method of reporting rapes; finally it is the psychologically disturbed and dangerous criminal who brutally attacks women in a violent, rather than sexual, actor rape who is the creator of the crisis.

A campus paper at a supposedly progressive, affirmative action, equal opportunity University should take the first step in realizing its responsibility in portraying violent crimes against women in their proper light.

Terry Teitelbaum
graduate, political science

Kicking into a new awareness

Justifications for disillusion and cynicism grow like weeds in history. They are the big events that shock millions of little Adams and Eves, some kicking and screaming, into an undesired, new awareness.

reporter's notebook brooks dareff

Yet the end of innocence is very much a private affair, something of often visceral immediacy. As such, individuals paint their scarlet letters on the events closest to them: the trench and chemical warfare of World War I, Hiroshima, or Watergate, to name a few.

The death of John Kennedy exactly 20 years ago was the symbol of the loss of innocence for at least one generation, all the more so because in retrospect it anticipated in such quick succession the other ripping asunder events of the 1960s and '70s. The race riots, Vietnam, the assassinations of Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy, Watergate, assassination attempts on two presidents, a failing economy, the Iran crisis, — all led the silent majority into a deepening pit of disillusion about the country's spiritual, philosophical and economic well being. And the death of John Kennedy seemed to start all that.

Some people carried the symbol idea to religious or cosmic extremes. Independent of other historical forces, the violence and upheaval of the 1960s were a punishment for what we, in Dallas at 12:30 p.m., Nov. 22, 1963, had done to John Kennedy.

There were, of course tremendous historical forces rumbling beneath the surface, far bigger than Kennedy himself, waiting to explode. Movements of national self-determination rocked the country from without, and of racial, sexual and economic equality

from within.

But symbols are something to hang your hat on, and to millions of Americans, on the day John Kennedy was killed a dark, foul cloud blighted this country, and with it, its confidence and optimism.

Aside from the fact that he was president, much of the symbolic power of Kennedy's death came from the man himself. In January, 1963, Kennedy's approval rate, according to pollsters, was well over 70 percent.

As University Political Science Prof. James Klonoski, by his own description a "Humphrey man," said, Kennedy's lofty, "new frontier" rhetoric gushed an idealism which, whether real or affected, stylish or substantive, "infected the country."

And many of his programs bore out that idealism.

Through the Peace Corps and the Alliance for Progress, the nation would help the third world to help itself. (This is not to mention that Kennedy was enamored with counter-insurgency and originated the Green Berets.) Through the space program we would conquer the very heavens.

Kennedy nearly oozed youthful buoyancy and optimism. And he was, literally young.

Young people identified with Kennedy, just 43 when he was elected, in a way its probably hard to understand today. He played touch football, went sailing, had a young, beautiful wife.

"He captured the fancy of America's youth," says Klonoski.

Not long after Kennedy's death, then assistant secretary of labor Daniel Moynihan, offered a hopeful vision of the future, yet still seemed to close the door on his generation's innocence.

"We'll laugh again," he said. "It's just that we'll never be young again."

Brooks Dareff is the Emerald's politics editor.

letters

It itself

Stuart Shaw needs to know that he doesn't have the luxury of popular Christian consent in regards to his liberal theological viewpoint. An orthodox Christian, and in fact anyone who takes the Bible at face value, realizes that whether or not he or she may agree, it itself claims absolute authority (Psalm 119:160, Proverbs 30:5-6). To rely on it to suggest that there is no such absolute is contradictory. It doesn't take a theologian to perceive the irony that "If God doesn't care and chooses to ignore ya, tell it to the people of Sodom and Gomorrah." There is a right, and a wrong.

There is an absolute truth portrayed.

Shaw's muddled thinking even conflicts with the basic tenets of philosophy, ethics, logic, and especially theology. The Bible forces one to choose it or abortion. Both cannot be held affirmatively. Shaw, obviously due to his lack of affinity with the text, has succumbed to pluralistic thought and thus convenience is the law he keeps. Shaw accurately goes to the basis of his heresy when he debunks the authority of the Bible. If it's not authoritative, then it is permeated with lies; for it does claim absoluteness. I rather think that Shaw is the one who is lying, deceived, and deceiving.

Dean Hanley

mentioning conscience in supporting his stand, particularly since conscience is possibly the least absolute and tangible aspect of our personalities.

Shaw's pro-choice argument is smooth and convincing. Yet I know of equally sound pro-life counter-rationale. Any attempt to resolve the abortion issue by dialectic seems doomed; were logic the only criterion on which to base my decision, it would fluctuate depending on my mood. But abortion is a moral issue, which implies conscience, not cold logic. Whether religious or not, each of us has gut feelings about what is right and wrong. And I suspect most of us inherently feel that snuffing out a fetus' life, human or not, is not right.

John Gibbons
law

Refreshing

In the face of such an emotionally charged issue as abortion, it was refreshing to read Stuart Shaw's thoughtful, even-tempered and notably humanitarian defense of freedom of choice. His assertion that the Bible cannot be used to turn abortion into a black and white issue ties in nicely with his proposition that the freedom of choice dictum is in response to our recognition that there are few if any absolutes. I was surprised, though, that a campus minister would neglect

No surprise

Being grabbed by a stranger and dragged down the street is physical violence. Being pushed to the ground is physical violence. Rape is physical violence.

I'm surprised to learn that the police department does not consider a man maliciously grabbing a woman to be a violent act. On second thought, no, I'm not surprised.

Shasta Hatter
English

oregon daily

emerald

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published Monday through Friday except during exam week and vacations, by the Oregon Daily Emerald Publishing Co., at the University of Oregon, Eugene, OR, 97403.

The Emerald operates independently of the University with offices on the third floor of the Erb Memorial Union and is a member of the Associated Press.

News and Editorial
Display Advertising and Business
Classified Advertising
Production
Circulation

686-5511
686-3712
686-4343
686-4381
686-5511

Editor
Managing Editor
News Editor
Assistant News Editor
Editorial Page Editor
Photo Editor
Sports Editor
Sidelines Editor
Entertainment Editor
Assistant Entertainment Editor
Night Editor
Associate Editors
Higher Education
Departments and Schools
Student Government
Features
Politics
Community
General Staff
Advertising Manager
Classified Advertising
Production Manager
Controller

Debbie Howlett
Sandy Johnstone
Frank Shaw
Brenda Thornton
Cort Fernald
Dave Kao
Doug Levy
John Healy
Angela Allen Morgan
Kim Carlson
Cort Fernald
Doug Nash
Melissa Martin
Jim Moore
Joan Herman
Brooks Dareff
Michele Matassa
Darlene Gore
Sally Oljar
Victoria Koch
Jean Ownbey