

Married couple rule should not continue

The Amazon Policy Board will meet Tuesday to consider recommending elimination of the married couple priority in access to certain University housing.

The married couple priority has no rational relationship to the University's educational mission, and should be eliminated. This will not adversely affect anyone with children, because parents with children are automatically eligible for priority.

The University is in the housing business only because housing is deemed a necessary part of its educational mission. The present policy expresses a value judgment that marriage is better than other human relationships functionally identical to marriage. The policy does nothing else.

In determining access to University housing, the University should consider factors related to access to education. Consider parenthood. Consider financial need. Consider course load or student loan obligations. Consider any factor with demonstrable bearing on student need for housing.

Marriage is not such a factor. Is there a rational distinction related to the University's educational mission that can be made between married couples and unmarried and gay couples? Assuming all other variables are the same, e.g. years together, no children, income, there is no difference.

Marriage is a legal status, no more, no less. By itself it bears no relationship to need for access to University managed housing.

An unmarried couple together five years has no educationally related needs that differ from a couple married five years. Educationally related needs are the only ones the University should consider.

Societal institutions change over time. Marriage is a popular and satisfying option through which many people organize their lives. It is not the only way. It is not, in 1986, even the only socially acceptable way.

Gay men and lesbians cannot marry, and many heterosexual couples choose not to. These couples nonetheless have the same loving, caring, happy, angry, changing, growing partnerships as married couples. The University should recognize this fact.

The University now has a policy that rewards marriage and discounts non-marriage. This policy is irrational, senselessly discriminatory and unrelated to the University's educational mission. Change it to truly serve student needs.

A new policy that treats couples alike raises the possibility of occasional access by people not committed to each other, but just wanting to get into University housing. The same is true under the current policy.

The University is faced with a choice between imperfect options. The present policy is imperfect and irrationally discriminatory against non-married couples. A policy treating couples alike might also be imperfect, but it would not be inherently discriminatory.

We realize the complexity of revamping the housing policy. The University's housing staff should begin at square one and consider the modern role of student housing. A new policy should be drafted to reflect this role.

We urge the Amazon Policy Board to recommend the elimination of the married student priority. We further suggest that the housing staff begin drafting a new policy that considers and ranks criteria genuinely related to the housing needs of all student couples and parents.



Letters

For women only

In response to Darrel Rothauge's letter "no protection," we would like to make it clear that rape is indeed a violent act. However, this is no reason to limit protection from it. Why should anyone expose themselves to an opportunity where they could be abused?

The idea that some women driving or riding in a van could somehow initiate an act of sexual conduct is an absurd and uneducated statement. This van is driven by women for women, because we as a whole are finding ways in which to minimize the acts of rape, as well as sexual harassment and abuse.

Neither one of us is a lesbian, however, this does not detract from the fact that we found your comments about them distasteful and preposterous. No lesbian is a man trapped in a woman's body. Perhaps you should give some real thought to that statement. You are in effect saying it is actually men who are the danger to all the "innocent women." There are very few women who would rape another woman in the manner such as men do.

In creating project safe-ride,

the objective for all women is to provide protection and create an atmosphere of trust for one another. This crucial element of trust is not easily placed in the hands of men by most women in today's society.

If you so feel a need to be protected, why not create a shuttle-van service of your own instead of attempting to destroy an obviously good and worthy project?

Stacey B. Atwell
Bonnie A. Bates

Marriage best

The last thing the University (or society in general) should do is encourage homosexuality. Benefits reserved for married couples should never be granted to homosexuals living together, nor should laws be changed to allow same-sex marriages.

Even from a purely biological perspective homosexuality is a maladaptive behavior which is counterproductive to any society. Besides medical problems, the practice certainly does nothing to perpetrate the species, and any society which encourages such behaviors will eventually perish. That's why successful societies, such as western civilization, have traditionally encouraged heterosexual marriages so as to have stable and responsible environments for families to be raised. This enables the people and culture to survive generation after generation.

Two or more guys living together, and having homosexual relations have never been regarded as families. Their behavior makes no real contribution to the survival of a people and if a large percentage of a particular people engaged in such lifestyles the people would soon die out.

Let's not give homosexual relations any more legitimization than already exists. The

heterosexual family unit is the backbone of all successful societies on earth. Our country has a stake both in preserving and encouraging the traditional family unit as well as discouraging maladaptive and counter-evolutionary forms of behavior.

Michael Cross
Political Science/History

No Philistine

The comments of Professor Robert Hurwitz (Emerald, April 4) about KWAX announcer Mike Lee are of interest. The professor takes Mr. Lee for a rather brazen Philistine loosed upon the formal world of classical music. Professor Hurwitz builds his case based on an interview in the ODE that ran March 17.

I know there's no disputing taste. But it only seems fair that before one darkens another's name that he owes the victim a just hearing. I've had occasion to listen to Mr. Lee on KWAX. While the professor's letter suggests some DJ indifferently spinning platters, Sex Pistols or Scriabin, it's just a needle in d'groove, mon; my experience is otherwise. Mr. Lee's style is unobtrusive and hardly inappropriate.

Professor Hurwitz is entirely correct that there is form to "classical" music. A Mozart piano sonata, for example, cannot really be appreciated until one learns that there are defined parts that fit together according to a pattern. Time and effort are required in order to learn what to listen for. The professor might want to criticize Mr. Lee for being *uninformed*, at least based on the interview published. But as a KWAX announcer, Lee's style is scarcely too *informal*. Mr. Lee's program deserves an audit, a listening to, before a judgment is made based on obviously edited comments!

Eric Press
GTF

Monday, April 14, 1986

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, Oregon, 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.

The Emerald is private property. The unlawful removal or use of papers is prosecutable by law.

General Staff

Advertising Director: Susan Thelen
Production Manager: Russell H. Steele
Classified Advertising: Vince Adams
Assistant to the Publisher: Jean Ownbey

Advertising Sales: David Wood - Sales Manager, John Boiler, Jessica Cederberg, Michael Gray, Laura Goldstein, Robin Joannides, Carlos Lamadrid, Marcia Leonard, Shawn Leuthold, Catherine Lijja, Shawna Reed, Kathy Stein, Joan Wildermuth, Laura Willoughby.

Production: Vince Adams, Kelly Alexandre, Lynne Casey, Shu-Shing Chen, Ellen Cross, Stormi Dykes, Manuel Flores, Shannon Gaither, Ross Martin, Mary May, Mary McGonigal, Rob Miles, Angie Muniz, Charla Parker, Ken Parrott, Jennifer Peterson, Jim Pfaff, Geoff Rainville, Michele Ross, Alyson Simmons, Gregory Tipps.

Editor: Julie Shippen
Managing Editor: Michelle Brence
News Editor: Jolayne Houtz
Editorial Page Editor: Alan Contreras
Assistant Editorial Page Editor: Scott Harding
Sports Editor: Robert Collias
Photo Editor: James Marks
Friday Edition Editor: Sheila Landry
Sidelines Editor: Allan Lazo
Night Editor: Jolayne Houtz

Associate Editors
Community/Politics
Higher Education
Student Activities
Student Government
University Affairs
General Assignment

Reporters: Tony Ahern, Sean Axmaker, Dan Coran, Kim Kaady, Capi Lynn, Amy Moss, Chuck Thompson, B.J. Thomsen.

Photographers: Shu-Shing Chen, Maria Corvallis, Steve Gibbons, Derrel Hewitt, Ross Martin.

News and Editorial: 686-5511
Display Advertising and Business: 686-3712
Classified Advertising: 686-4343
Production: 686-4381
Circulation: 686-5511

Paul Sturtz
Andrew LaMar
Chris Norred
Stan Nelson
Kirsten Bolin
Mike Rivers