

Media awaits prior restraint decision

A federal judge recently refused to let CNN broadcast audio tapes it acquired between Manuel Noriega and people working for his defense. When did judges receive veto power?

A vital premise of American media is the issue of prior restraint — judicial orders against publication.

Judges should not be editors. Judges may rule on libel laws in a suit after material is printed — but not before.

Print and broadcast media are usually very careful about what they print or broadcast. They have teams of lawyers to research potential libel suits. Lawsuits cost tremendous amounts of time and money, regardless of whether one wins or loses.

The judge issued the prior restraint order in this case saying if the tapes are broadcast it might make it difficult for Noriega to get a fair trial. And the fact that tapes were made from Noriega's jail cell is another matter in itself.

There are precedents. Former Pentagon employee Daniel Ellsberg received permission from the courts to publish The Pentagon Papers in the early 1970s. The Nixon Administration argued that publishing these papers would jeopardize national security.

Instead the American people discovered disturbing secrets the government wanted to keep from them.

CNN made a mistake by broadcasting a second Noriega tape after the restraint order was announced. CNN should have waited for the ruling on its appeal. Judges do not like to be ignored and this only enhances sentiment against CNN.

The 11th Court of Appeals upheld the prior restraint order. Now the case is going to the Supreme Court for a final review.

Sometime a reporter, newspaper, or television station must ignore a judge's order if certain information was essential to proving innocence in a murder case, for instance. But CNN was not in any such rush and therefore has given all media a slap in the face.

The Supreme Court should overrule the Court of Appeals and allow the broadcasting of the Noriega tapes. But CNN should have waited for a final high court decision before violating a judge's order.

The final outcome is yet to be written in this saga. But if the Supreme Court does not overturn the appeal, we can only wonder what part CNN's arrogance played in the decision.



All hunters not to blame for illegal kills

It happens every year around this time. Hunting season opens and illegal kills begin. While most sportsmen respect the game laws and are honest hunters, a few don't and give all hunters a bad name.

Last week, two bull elk were illegally killed as they walked along the border of their refuge. The elk carcasses, and all the subsequent meat, were left to rot. Game wardens in the area believe some frustrated hunters may have decided they were going to bag an elk this season, legally or not. This could be one answer to the question of why anyone would commit such a wasteful act. But it is also possible that it was simply the act of some irresponsible citizens out to have a good time.

Much of the poaching that takes place is done by families who depend on the cheap meat to offset small household budgets. While the activity is illegal, it is almost forgivable as long as the meat from the animal is being put to use by people who need it.

However, shooting two bull elk while

they are in a protected area, and then leaving them to rot, is not forgivable in any way. It is this sort of heinous waste and irresponsibility that disgusts hunters and non-hunters alike. Acts like this will only lead to more restrictive hunting laws and eventually the elimination of a sport that has been passed down from parent to child for many generations.

A few seconds worth of cheap thrills are certainly not worth the consequences. Oregon hunting groups concerned about the illegal kill have already contributed to a reward fund to find the perpetrators. In fact, the majority of the outcry against the killing has come from hunters and hunting organizations. They realize the seriousness of the act and the effect it will have on the image of hunting in the state.

Although the shooting of the two elk should enrage all people who love animals and the outdoors, citizens should be open-minded enough not to blame all hunters for the acts of one or two.

LETTERS

Respect

In response to Frank Limbaugh's letter (ODE, Nov. 14): It is regrettable that one has to generalize an issue and misrepresent the points.

What Ingrid Newkirk was saying was that non-human animals deserve the respect and freedom as much as human animals do. What all non-human animals ask for is to be left alone with some clean air, water and land to live their lives out in peace.

A slug cannot drive a car nor would it ever want to — that is not what any non-human is asking for. If you look around you will see that the degradation and destruction of this Earth today was not caused by a slug, a cat or any non-human animal but by the hands of human ones.

Non-human animals are not "ours" to use, abuse or kill for the betterment of one species.

Monica Semeria
SETA

Generalizing

I'm writing in response to Michelle E. Loew's Grateful Dead ban protest, (ODE, Nov. 12), or was it a greek bashing

letter? I'm not quite sure.

She asks, "Why are Dead fans being punished for yet another example of violent criminality on the part of the greek system?" I don't see the connection. What does the greek system have to do with the Grateful Dead ban? Let me answer that: nothing.

I'm so tired of people griping about the whole greek system each time individual members step out of line. If a non-greek person does something wrong only the individual is criticized, but when someone within the greek system does something wrong, the entire group is criticized. I certainly wouldn't condone the actions of particular people within the greek system. It's not without it's faults. Just like any other group, individuals within it may be worthy of criticism, but not the whole group.

I'm not defending the greek system, I'm defending all groups that are attacked because of the activities of certain individuals. This includes fans of the Grateful Dead presently under attack because of the generalizations made about the behaviors of particular people. I try to look at people as individuals and not judge them because of group affiliation. I

wish people like Loew would do the same.

And by the way, I want the Dead back too.

Stephanie R. Summers
Rhetoric and Communication

Brandwagon

It would seem that University President Myles Brand has jumped on the bandwagon of reckless liberalism much to the detriment of the majority of students.

After CIA recruiter Thomas Culhane was forced to cancel his scheduled interviews, Brand was quoted as saying, "We did not show him the door, he chose not to continue his interviews."

I suppose Brand considers 40 screaming, uncivilized ruffians as conducive to the interview process. I guess Brand is oblivious to the fact that by requiring the CIA to conduct business on campus he is personally responsible for the disruption.

It's not as though he didn't know there would be a howling mob opposed to the CIA. I'm just glad the mob didn't hurt anyone seriously.

In the future, I hope Brand won't believe that these little demonstrations will deter po-

tential CIA employees, because I for one, intend to apply next year.

Matt Kokkeler
History/Political Science

Harmful

I invite Frank Limbaugh to reflect on how alike humans are with animals, since he believes an animal is just an animal and not an individual (ODE, Nov. 15).

We all learned, as far back as the first grade, that animals and humans fall under the same category, mammals — warm-blooded animals.

Maybe the next time Limbaugh and all of us defecate or copulate we should ponder what we look like, and how many basic "animal characteristics" we possess.

Limbaugh also pointed out

that slugs don't drive cars and cats can't build buildings. This is true, but slugs aren't in the Persian Gulf fighting over the very thing that keeps cars running, and cats don't have the capacity to build nuclear missiles that are capable of destroying the Earth. Human intelligence is a wonderful thing, but how we choose to use it can be incredibly harmful.

Just because we are more intelligent than animals, we do not have the right to dominate and harm them. Because they lack human intelligence, animals are very innocent and all they really want, in the words of Ingrid Newkirk (national director of People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, who Limbaugh found so offensive and ridiculous), is "to be left alone."

Carolyn Hauck
Student

LETTERS POLICY

The Oregon Daily Emerald will attempt to print all letters containing comments on topics of interest to the University community. Comments must be factually accurate and refrain from personal attacks on the character of others.