

Wyden's decision leaves us unhappy

It was shaping up as one heck of a political contest. Sen. Mark Hatfield, a Republican seeking his fifth term, against Rep. Ron Wyden, five-term Democrat from Portland's 3rd Congressional District.

Political pundits agreed Hatfield was vulnerable. His stand on such issues as old-growth timber and abortion had left some of his constituents ready for a change. A well-known, strong political figure could challenge him. And experts agreed that person was Ron Wyden.

Wyden made it known he was thinking about the Senate seat. He is a respected member of the House with a high-profile seat on the Energy and Commerce Committee. His specialty is crime and health care issues. He knows what he's doing.

National Democratic officials gave him support. Over \$700,000 was raised in anticipation of a Senate race. Political observers waited for the official announcement.

It never came. This Tuesday, Wyden turned his back on the Senate seat and instead, quietly filed for re-election in his Congressional district.

We were disappointed when we heard the news. We think highly of Wyden, and Hatfield has alienated us recently with his increasingly conservative moves. We hoped Wyden would make Hatfield answer some of our nagging questions.

Instead, Hatfield is almost a shoo-in for reelection, with only one candidate coming forth to challenge him. That candidate, Bend businessman Harry Lonsdale, is a political neophyte with almost no chance of beating Hatfield.

Wyden gave several reasons for keeping out of the race: loss of the influence he has built in the House, the strain on his family, and little possibility of an important committee appointment if he were elected to the Senate.

All of these are valid reasons, but we wonder how much Wyden was influenced by a recent *Oregonian* statewide telephone poll of 513 voters, which showed Hatfield with a 48 percent to 36 percent advantage.

We also wonder how much the Oregon Democratic Caucus had to do with Wyden's decision. Six Portland Democrats, some of them state legislators, were considering running for Wyden's House seat if he went after Hatfield.

Right now, the Democrats hold a slim 31-29 majority in the Oregon House. If several of the current state Representatives bolted for a try at a national office, it possibly would have created enough of a political vacuum that the Republicans could have gained more seats and wrested control of the House.

Whatever the reasons, we were disappointed with Wyden's decision.



Demo fine shows how state politics work

It pretty much went the route of a typical political scandal: accusation, evidence, arguments, and finally, punishment.

The scandal in this case was missing money from the House Democratic Caucus' political fund, and the punishment was a state record \$61,234 fine levied against the caucus and several individuals by Secretary of State Barbara Roberts.

The main targets have been current House Majority Leader David Dix (D-Eugene) and his predecessor, current state Sen. Shirley Gold (D-Portland). Both incurred fines from the investigation.

Dix is taking his punishment quietly, apologizing for the violations and promising to pay \$23,872 either out of his own pocket, or from donor contributions.

Gold, on the other hand, has taken the issue to another level. She is refusing to pay the fine, instead announcing she will take the matter up in court.

Roberts, who said the Democrats were "a little fast and loose" with their campaign funds, said she found no evidence the Democrats were deliberately covering up the election violations. But this has had little or no effect on Gold.

She said Roberts does not have the authority to levy fines because the campaign finance reports were filed such a long time

ago. She also contends she had no knowledge of any wrongdoing, and therefore cannot be held accountable.

Gold's actions leave a lot to be desired. Ignorance of the crime is not a defense. Gold was the majority leader at the time. She is responsible, whether she had any direct knowledge or not.

Looking at the reactions of Gold and Dix provides insight into state politics. Dix has said he wants to pay the fine as quickly as possible and get the issue behind him.

That shouldn't come as much of a surprise. Dix faces reelection next year, and he wants to keep his majority leader post. A scandal such as this could ruin him, politically. Already, members of his own party have asked him to step down. House Republicans have said they have no intention of letting the issue drop.

Gold, on the other hand, won't be up for reelection until 1993. Voter memories rarely last that long.

While we can't commend Dix for his actions in the scandal, we can applaud his effort to act responsibly once charged. But we have nothing nice to say about Gold's efforts. She seems to be trying to shift the blame by protestations and loud proclamations.

Letters

Out of my face

If Rodney Layton (*ODE*, Nov. 27) wants so badly for protesters to change their methods, why doesn't he take his own advice and infiltrate their ranks.

By his own philosophy, if his convictions are truly strong, he should be willing even to die for his cause; if not, will he please "get out of our faces?"

John Shenon
Student

Darn

I have to question Rodney Layton's logic ("Infiltrate" *ODE*, Nov. 28) that the act of protesting a problem is synonymous with "passing it onto the next person."

I need to thank the protesters for their actions. If it hadn't been for them, I would never have realized the sexual-orientation discrimination of the CIA. The noise they made was

front page news, and had the entire University buzzing about what should be done. There are conflicting opinions, but people are talking, and that is the first step to change.

According to Layton, the first step should be to "infiltrate the system." I'm sorry, but this is reality, not the "A-Team." He uses the example of Martin Luther King Jr. as one who infiltrated the system, but remember the civil rights movement started with the civil disobedience of Rosa Parks in a city bus, not dissimilar to Tim Hughes' blocking of the CIA interview room door; an action which did lead to his arrest.

Unfortunately, Tim Hughes, Shannon Oliver and others won't get Layton's respect until they "die for their causes" as King and Ghandi did. Darn.

Stephen Thomas
Fine and Applied Arts

Venom

In response to the Nov. 27 re-

view of the movie *Prancer* by Gerry White. White's review is melodramatic, immature and cynical. He attacks the film, its creators and actors with un-called-for venom.

I assume the *ODE* hired White to responsibly and objectively review current movies. I cannot understand how his employers have made such a grave mistake in finding his critique either responsible or objective.

He criticizes the film as being "unrealistic." It is not necessary for a movie to be realistic for it to be enjoyable — especially to children.

He says the "photography relies on stupid camera tricks that (you) have seen several million times," — not just one million, but several million. Children would not consider these tricks stupid and mundane, as they are exactly that, children. They haven't seen those tricks a million times.

He is a self-proclaimed *Pollyanna* hater. It is in poor judgment that a hater of such a children's classic would be chosen to review another children's

movie.

It seems that White no longer appreciates the greatest charm of children's movies: simplicity. I ask that he not waste time with such "atrocities," and if he must continue with his overdramatized and blatantly biased style, that he please confine himself to the grocery stand tabloids, where this kind of garbage would fit right in.

To submit a negative review is one thing, but such an attack is unwarranted and in bad taste.

Loretta Leake
Marketing

Vocal minority

I read with amazement the articles in the *Emerald* and *Register-Guard* about student and Eugene Police Department relations.

A vocal minority of students on and off campus seem to think that drug abuse, alcohol abuse and anything else, is their inherent right to practice

around here because it's their "place."

I cannot grasp why the majority of you tolerate these people. EPD reacted to a riot situation and responded accordingly. It is unfortunate that they didn't respond to the on-campus rioting during last February's snow storm.

That small majority got many of you to join them that night. I was there. I spent most of that night, along with other co-workers, repairing your fun. We never did get an accurate count, but you managed to litter 23 of your fellow classmates' rooms with broken glass.

It took almost all night to board up your damage. You may have had fun, but we froze our butts off working in extremely hazardous conditions. I would've much preferred 100 policemen on campus, persuading you not to act in this manner.

Gordon Melby
Maintenance Dept.
Friday, December 8, 1989