

Records amendment not a joking matter

The University submitted an amendment to its student conduct code regulations Tuesday to clear up misconceptions in the administrative rules used to mandate open hearings in academic dishonesty cases.

The amended version was originally expected to go into effect today, but due to date miscalculations on the part of the University, the amendment won't see action for quite a while.

While the amendment has been sorely needed — and we applaud the University for its epiphany — we can't help but wonder about the University's sudden change of heart.

The conduct code mandates that all cases contested under the student conduct code be open to the public; and to the extent necessary to preserve order, the hearing's presiding officer has the authority to limit attendance of people present at the meeting.

The amended version of the code, should it ever come to light, specifically states that if prosecuted students do not waive their right to privacy in writing, the hearings officer is required to close the hearing to the public.

Perhaps the only reason questions about the code were raised was because Willy Bils, a third-year law student who had earlier filed suit against the University and law school dean for alleged privacy violations concerning his academic records, attended a recent conduct code hearing to challenge the code's procedure.

The amendment, as it stood previous to date miscalculations, was only temporary and would have lapsed in 180 days. The University administration would then have considered the need for further rule-making after a thorough review by the Student Conduct Committee.

What concerns us is what action the University administration intends to take — not only immediately — but when the amendment is allegedly set out in black-and-white. It seems as though the University was caught in a quandary from which it had no other recourse than to amend the conduct code to avoid further legal problems. If the University administration only wishes to keep trouble out of its own backyard, how much power will the amendment carry?

A student's personal records should be protected from public scrutiny at all costs. The amendment should've been in place long ago. And now that the paths are clear to set it in place, it had better be taken seriously.



Rust takes a stand with spotted owl plan

Hardly anybody noticed his calm, rational voice in the continuing public outcry over the old growth logging controversy, but it was nice to hear that Lane County Commissioner Jerry Rust took a stand in support of the spotted owl.

At a sparsely attended press conference last Monday, Rust outlined a plan that he claimed would solve the spotted owl controversy. Actually, his proposal is not likely to solve anything — it is a sketchy plan that has received little attention or serious consideration. But Rust's ideas do show that he has a good, rational grasp on the factors involved in the issue. After the hyperbole of debate, any voice of moderation is welcome.

Rust realizes that the timber industry can only continue to log old growth forest for so much longer, before either wildlife preservation limits halt logging or there isn't any old growth left to log. With these absolute limits, the commissioner argues that the industry must make adjustments now — begin logging second growth.

The end of old growth logging that Rust warns of is not news. Environmentalists have argued this point for years, and the industry must grudgingly admit the truth of

the matter. To start the transition, Rust calls for a federal appropriation of \$100 million over a two-year period to create jobs in second growth management.

Rust's plan is both common sense and fanciful dream. Rust understands the issues at work, but it is doubtful that the federal government will allocate the funds Rust requests. It could certainly do so — there is an annual sizable federal fund for the construction of timber roads. The Rust proposal is also very similar to proposals bandied about by the National Audubon Office; these proposals have never been considered seriously by the timber industry.

The local media didn't bother much with the Rust plan, in part because the commissioner's plain common sense just didn't make good copy. Reason can't compete with an infamous, histrionic sound bite like the one aired from State Sen. Peg Jolin (D-Cottage Grove) last week: "And the spotted owl...I think belong(s) in one's frying pan."

We appreciate Rust taking a wise stand on the spotted owl, and we wish everyone were so willing to engage in practical discussion as the commissioner appears to be.

Letters

Take a stand

I seem to recall reading about someone who was going to take a stand against "hate" crimes recently ...

In the letter entitled "BS" (ODE, April 17), I find that I am being accused of "seeking power and control rather than the well-being of unwanted children," because I take the same stand as Bill Moore. I search deep to find any motive of controlling other people, but I find none. Money is a prime tool of control in this society. So why do I give it to the poor instead of hoarding it up to mount an assault by which to gain control? I must be either really stupid, or I must not fit into the mold which Pam's word has positively stuffed me into! She also says that it has "proven presumptuous to believe these types ... have morals!"

Thank you, Pam, for these stereotypes whose roots lie in an unfounded assumption as to what I and all others of my "type" (did you really say that?...arghhh!) have done for the "unwanted children." I cannot apologize for the actions of those who have stood with

"pro-lifers" for the wrong reasons, because I do not stand with them. They may share a cause, but that does not make us the same "type." Now, where is that person who was going to stand against hate crimes?

Bob Weigel
Lab technician

Keep to yourself

William Moore's anti-choice opinion (ODE, April 13) asserts as a fact that life entitled to constitutional rights exists at conception. Strangely enough, the medical community does not support this belief, much to the chagrin of our highly respected religious community.

It's hard to believe, but some people in this country disagree with the theory that a child exists upon ejaculation and supposedly these people have the right to believe as they wish. Moore thinks that our right to act differently from his accepted norm is not a civil right and I question just what the hell he thinks civil rights are all about. Maybe when Pat Robertson is

elected president, we'll find out.

Moore's recognition of unwanted pregnancies as "real" is observant. I'm sure Moore has researched contraceptive availability and realizes how well-accepted sex education is in our public schools. Therefore, I'm amazed his letter didn't address preventive pregnancy measures, especially how the white, male middle-class could educate themselves on the effects of their sperm. If you don't believe in choice, keep your sperm to yourself.

To Moore's question, do we have the right to destroy innocent lives, even a pagan pro-choicer would answer *no!* Negative stereotypes and poverty are too often the lot of innocent people who struggle to support children of unplanned pregnancies, especially if fathers are not responsible family members.

Think about it, Mr. Moore. Are you interested in upholding your principles, or inflicting them on other people?

Lauren Upshaw
Eugene

Society loses

In response to William Moore's letter (ODE, April 13) in defense of anti-abortion, I feel that his and others concern is not for those "defenseless, unborn children" but is the result of an over-adjusted sense of "moral reality."

Obviously the anti-abortion issue has been a major conflict for the past couple of weeks, but I think that the moralists are missing the point, because in my opinion, there is no way anybody can justify (morally or not) bringing an unwanted child into the world to face poverty, oppression and other unsavory traumas which can be avoided if women are allowed to make their own decisions.

I say the children are unwanted because they are. Sure, there are always people ready to adopt a new-born baby, but if abortions are made illegal, there will be too many babies to

add to the already large amount of unwanted children (the homeless) in our country.

When this happens, will all those moral anti-abortionists volunteer to be responsible for these human beings' welfare? Probably not, because the same voices (anti-abortionists) crying loudest to end abortion are the same voices urging cutbacks in the welfare system, child care and minimum wage. Obviously, anti-abortionists only care about these lives while they are still unborn.

In conclusion, I feel that the anti-abortionists should concentrate on seeing reality, instead of hiding behind their morality, because the losers are not only the women and the children (after they are born) but eventually our whole society.

Susan Price
Pre-journalism

Letters Policy

Letters to the editor must be limited to no more than 250 words, legible, signed and the identification of the writer must be verified.