

Pro-choice march can celebrate wins

Everywhere there are signs that the pro-abortion movement continues to gain ground.

After years of complacent dormancy, secure with the protection of *Roe vs. Wade*, the movement was rocked back to life by last year's Supreme Court decision granting states greater freedom in regulating abortion and the continuing attacks by anti-choice forces on abortion clinics.

The pro-abortion movement needed to muster the same fervor their anti-abortion foes regularly dish out. Happily, they've done so in smashing ways. This year's surprise congressional bill that would have provided funding for abortions in cases of rape or incest was one example, despite President Bush's veto, of how the pro-choice movement could mobilize.

An even better example came after the results of important elections across the nation this week. In races where abortion was a major issue, such as the gubernatorial tilts in New Jersey and Virginia and the New York City mayoral election, the anti-choice faction took a beating.

And so we come to the national pro-choice march this Sunday, "Mobilize for Women's Lives." The election results shouldn't be a signal that the pro-choice movement can relax — instead they should provide a cause for celebration.

A similar march last April drew more than 300,000 women to Washington, D.C. and more than 500 here in Eugene. The numbers could be even greater this time around. The local rally begins in the EMU Courtyard at 1 p.m. and will culminate at 2:30 with a march to the Federal Building.

A new addition to this month's rally is a student group dedicated to the pro-choice fight. Students for Choice formed on the University campus recently and already claims about 50 members. In addition to lobbying for pro-choice legislation, the group hopes to provide support for women facing abortions and information on abortion and birth control.

Students for Choice is still seeking more people, and the rally will be a good chance for sympathetic students to check out the group and get involved.

If this is an issue you care at all about, you should attend Sunday's rally. And if you don't care that anti-abortion forces are trying to endanger women's lives (by forcing them to seek dangerous back-alley abortions) or the quality of women's lives (by forcing them to have unwanted children), you might want to attend anyway and witness why you should be concerned about such matters.



Right to use peyote shouldn't be infringed

This past Monday, in the halls of the U.S. Supreme Court, a trial started involving one of the most sacred rights we have as Americans: freedom of religion.

Freedom to worship whomever or whatever we like is one of the reasons the country was founded. The pilgrims fled England to escape religious persecution. The framers of the Constitution made sure to separate church and state.

Now this freedom may be infringed.

The case involves the Native American Church, and their use of peyote in religious ceremonies. Peyote is a hallucinogenic drug, outlawed in Oregon. Church officials consider it a sacrament, and part of their religious culture.

And Oregon Attorney General Dave Frohnmayer wants to take peyote away from them.

Frohnmayer will argue the state's case, contesting whether Native Americans can use peyote for religious purposes.

On this, we vehemently oppose Frohnmayer and his case.

Native Americans and their culture were here a long time before the first people stepped off the *Mayflower*. For at least 400

years, peyote has been a part of Native Americans' religious culture and heritage.

Under fire is whether the constitutional guarantee of religious freedom protects religions which use illegal substances in their ceremonies. If the Supreme Court takes this right away, it will send shock waves through other organized religions.

Why is the case focusing on Native Americans and peyote? Why not the Catholic church? We've never heard about anybody contesting the right of Catholics to give minors eucharist wine.

Frohnmayer's case is not only challenging a basic right, it's discriminatory as well.

Opponents to Native American peyote use say if they can use an illegal drug, anybody could come along, claiming their drug use was part of a "religious ceremony."

In response, we feel this argument does not hold water. As we said, the Native American culture has been around for a long time.

Frohnmayer and the rest of the Oregon law community should close the case. We firmly back Native Americans in their right to unrestricted religious expression. Do not outlaw peyote.

Letters

Criteria

I suggest the following criteria as relevant to the question of the appropriateness of the disruption of the University science buildings' dedication:

Did the protesters have sufficient opportunity to have their messages heard in other forums?

Were these forums unbiased in the sense that there was some reasonable hope the merits of their cases would be seriously considered, and did they have power to actually do anything to further their cases?

If not (to either of the above), then was the protest disruptive to the point of actually causing physical harm to anyone, or substantially interfering with anything of equal or greater importance?

If not, then their protest was justified.

Andrew Thompson
University Counseling Center

Thank you note

On behalf of the Oregon Student Public Interest Research Group, I would like to extend

my thanks to the student body and the EMU Administration for helping us schedule accommodations for the 9th annual Western Public Interest Research Group Organizing Conference, which was held at the University two weekends ago.

I would especially like to thank state Sen. Grattan Kerans for his inspirational keynote address at the conference. Sen. Kerans is an example of a legislator who truly works for the citizens of the community, and supports students in our efforts to make our state and our world a better place to live.

Dalene Lovie
Chapter Chair
Oregon Student Public Interest Research Group

Shortcut

I've done it and you've done it. We've all taken those harmless little shortcuts during our headlong flurries between classes. Surely I'm not the only person who enjoys the natural setting of our campus and there are probably those who marvel at the vestige of trees in this urban setting.

The campus is necessarily a mediation of bushes and buildings, trees and sidewalks. I invite everyone to look around them while on their way, and notice that within the maze of sidewalks around each building, there is another set of paths worn through the grass and bushes.

I feel the path of least resistance is an ugly one. Surely I am not alone.

Steve Seiller
Student

Hypocritical

In your Nov. 3 edition, you did an editorial on the issue of flag burning. It made no sense.

You write: "No matter how stupid the law is, it should be enforced like any other law ... we don't support the flag burning law. But neither do we support the FBI and local police letting the law slide."

What does this mean? It's like saying, "I don't support apartheid, but since it is the law, I think it should be enforced." Nice logic! You might as well have said, "People

should be allowed to burn the American flag; they should simply have to go to jail for a year afterwards."

I just had to release some of my nausea after reading such an un-thought-out, hypocritical editorial.

Phil Zuckerman
Sociology

Unethical funds

In response to Shannon Oliver's letter (ODE, Oct 31) on military funding for science, I must infer that, although I agree with most of her points, her argument that the NIH and NSF are good alternative sources for funding is not altogether true.

These institutions do fund basic research, but in many cases, the definition of basic research is unclear and perhaps too broad.

In one case, research that could be termed basic and that received \$280 thousand from NIH, involved placing adult female baboons in 95 degree water until 50 percent of their bodies were burned, then mon-

itoring liver function to determine the "effects of burn shock on the liver." There was no mention in the grant of any post-operative anesthesia.

In another experiment funded by the NSF, it was found that rats preferred to receive warning before the floor of their cage was electrified. The relevant application of this to human or animal health evades me.

These two examples are drawn from thousands of examples of documented research, funded by these two institutions, that were both cruel, inhuman, and inapplicable to human or animal research. The NIH and NSF may not be the military, but they are not a good alternative for funding.

Unfortunately, there are few institutions that can be turned to for scientific funding, and that make complete and ethical reviews of the research they choose to fund. A general shift in ethics must occur within the scientific community before the situation can be expected to change.

Jill Freidberg
Students for the Ethical Treatment of Animals
Friday, November 10, 1989