

Say no to restrictive abortion measures

This November, Oregon voters will have a chance to vote on issues that could affect the entire nation. Two measures that could have this national impact are state ballot measures 8 and 10 — the abortion questions.

In states such as Idaho and Missouri, the whole country watched to see how the stringent pro-life measures would be received.

If passed, Measure 8 will prohibit all abortions except to prevent the death of a mother or in cases of reported rape or incest.

This measure should be defeated easily. Oregonians stand firmly in the corner of the woman's right to choose and Oregon voters will once again turn away this attempt to legislate personal moral decisions.

However, Measure 10 has a better chance of being approved by Oregon voters.

If passed, Measure 10 will require doctors to give two days notice to parents before performing an abortion on a minor.

On the surface, Measure 10 doesn't look very harmful. In best case scenarios, parents *should* take part in one of the most important decisions their child might face. However, the world is not made up of family units resembling the Brady Bunch or the Cosbys.

There are cases in which it would not be in the child's best interest for the parents to be informed. The varying family situations are not taken into consideration by Measure 10.

There are also no legal alternatives provided in Measure 10 for girls wanting to avoid telling their parents. States that have passed similar parent notification laws, such as Minnesota, have allowed court challenges to that notification. Oregon's version would allow no exceptions.

Those involved with abusive or incestuous family situations are not the only people who would be left out in the cold by the pro-life legislation.

Girls from a "perfect" and communicating family might find it easier to seek illegal, uncontrolled abortions rather than having to shatter their parent's expectations.

In this respect, Measure 10 would not promote sincere family communication.

The decision to inform others should be made by the person closest to the issue — the woman seeking the abortion.

Leave the decision-making to the person who is going to be effected by those decisions. Vote no on ballot measures 8 and 10.

"UNDERACHIEVER"



Coca-Cola's apartheid aftertaste remains

When divestment from South Africa was a big issue on the University campus a couple of years ago, Coca-Cola was targeted as one of the biggest investors in the apartheid system.

But a couple of mild concessions by Coca-Cola and the matter is forgotten. Until now.

Coca-Cola has reappeared in the EMU Fishbowl. It did not win a taste test with Pepsi nor is it going to cost less. Coca-Cola simply put in a lower bid than Pepsi.

Members of the Black Student Union at the University haven't forgotten. They ran a taste test last week outside the EMU Fishbowl. Coke in one container, the blood of South African blacks in the other. Drink Coca-Cola and you support the apartheid system.

Coca-Cola has sold its individual plants in South Africa to blacks. But it still retains trademark and bottling rights. It still gets 80 percent of the profits from the South African Coca-Cola plants.

The South African government receives

\$30 million in taxes from Coca-Cola. South Africa is still the only country on Earth with legalized apartheid.

How did Coke find its way back to the campus?

A state purchasing agent orders for the whole state of Oregon. The purchasing agent takes the lowest bid. The University Housing Director said it is not a political decision.

It certainly is a political decision. The University supports whatever company it buys from. The University is endorsing Coca-Cola's policy regardless of whether it knows it.

It is no excuse to say "the state buys for us." The state purchaser needs sensitivity training and the University must address student concerns before spending its money.

Students should let University administration know they are worried about what the state higher education system has done, and they should boycott the Coca-Cola products in the EMU and the residence halls.

LETTERS

Judgment call

Environmentalism is in: chemical corporations, power companies, packagers and fast food industries are hastily taking on that new green protective coloration. We even have an "environmental president."

In this climate, the Oregon Committee for Recycling was created to defeat Measure 6, the Oregon Recycling Initiative. And it was inevitable that the No on 4 Committee would send a mailing to all of us "environmental voters," signed by the persons who describe themselves as active environmentalists, claiming that shutting down the Trojan Nuclear power plant would damage the environment.

If you can't convince, confuse! And they do, telling us that our impulses to protect the environment by requiring recyclable packaging and by closing Trojan is right, but that our vote to do so would be wrong.

Apart from taking up the study of ecology, nuclear physics and the economics of packaging and electric power, there

are paths out of this confusion. One is to note where the big money is spent and to ask yourself if that is where you want your vote to go. Another is to realize that the "expertise" of the agencies hired to defeat the environmental initiatives is dedicated not to the truth, but to winning. Dispensing wisdom is not their business.

Do you want Trojan closed until it can be operated safely and its radioactive wastes can be safely disposed? Should packaging be recyclable or reusable? Trust your judgment! Vote Yes on measures 4 and 6.

Ellen Spear
Eugene

Manifestations

It is the Manifest Sanctuary Law that protects people in mental hospitals from politicians forcing themselves on the otherwise defenseless mental patient.

There has never been a documented case where a politician has been caught inside a mental hospital trying to tell the patient what he or she has to do,

or moving that patient out of the hospital.

If a politician was caught inside the hospital without notifying the patients' families, no matter what the case, the politician does not belong there.

Pete Fena
Graduate student
Corrections

Trivial diatribe

In response to Ronando Long (ODE, Oct. 18):

Your contemptuous little diatribe trivialized women's problems and twisted Enna Dole's remarks into a predictably patriarchal self-defense.

We feel that her concerns are appropriate when one considers the dangers that women face in their lives. A large majority of women have been or will be sexually harassed and/or abused in their lifetimes: at least every three minutes a woman is beaten, and every five minutes a woman is raped.

These statistics reflect only the reported cases. Some experts believe that the numbers

must be multiplied by a factor of 10 to account for those who are silent.

These facts become even more frightening when one realizes that the aggressors in these crimes cannot be pinned down into one particular category of men. They include men of all races, creeds, ages and backgrounds. When one broadens the definition of violence against women to include attitudes and verbal abuse, all women should be counted among the oppressed.

Avoiding situations that are potentially dangerous (in any sense) and voicing one's objections to those situations is everyone's inherent right, including Dole's.

We praise Dole for her awareness of the precariousness of women's lives and for her desire to deal with it in her own way. We do not think her approach is at all out of proportion.

Marina Wolf
Russian
Andrea Henry
Intl. Studies

How far?

Both Ronando Long's and R.J. Christiano's responses to Enna Dole's letter (ODE, Oct. 16) show exactly how far women have to go before they can possess the simple right of personal freedom.

The incidents that she describes were all too familiar to myself and other women. Long and Christiano, have you ever had to worry that you wouldn't be able to walk safely home at 11:30 p.m., or been followed too closely by a woman on the street? No! Then maybe you should rethink. Why do you assume, Long, that she was addressing all men and not just those who don't respect women's rights? And why Christiano, do you assume that women invite harassment? Yours is the most harmful argument I've heard.

You both missed the point so completely that I have to ask if you truly don't understand what women often have to face — or if you just don't want to.

Karen Smith
International Studies
Tuesday, October 23, 1990