

## For South Africans, freedom can be free

Citing clear progress toward racial equality in South Africa, George Bush lifted economic sanctions against that country.

The question over whether such sanctions are effective seems to have been answered by South Africa's moves toward abolishing apartheid. The sanctions clearly were a prime factor in the reforms.

What needs to be addressed now is whether Bush removed the sanctions prematurely. Leading congressional Democrats, civil rights groups and African National Congress leader Nelson Mandela think he has. When the sanctions law was first passed in 1986, after being vetoed by President Reagan, it contained five conditions that had to be met before sanctions could be repealed.

The conditions have now been met — at least on paper — by the South African government. Because of this, Bush, who has been opposed to the sanctions ever since he was vice president, has wasted no time at all in lifting them. However, while the letter of the law may have been met, the spirit of the anti-apartheid sanctions may have been lost.

The sanctions law was passed in hopes of creating incentive for South Africa to attain civil rights for all people. A move in that direction has been started, but there is still a long way to go even on the surface. For example, the five conditions attached to the sanctions did not include anything concerning voting rights of blacks. Because of this, in a country Bush said has made definite moves toward racial equality, the black majority of South Africans still cannot vote and cannot hold office.

South Africa has made progress toward removing the race barrier. Blacks can legally go to "white" beaches and restaurants, but they are still not allowed to play a part in their own destinies via the democratic process.

In his haste to ensure a good business climate in South Africa and throughout the world, Bush has prematurely abandoned the struggle for equality. And although the United States can once again claim South Africa as a market place, the president should remember that time-worn cliché — freedom isn't free.

## Famous BOY SCOUT KNOTS



SLIP KNOT



BOWLINE KNOT



SQUARE KNOT



KNOT ALLOWED



## LETTERS

### Fire n' stone

The effort of the governing bodies of the state of Oregon to ensure personal sexual preference as a protected minority status in regard to housing and employment opportunities is one of the darkest and most alarming prospects I have seen in years.

Individuals or groups that practice, encourage, promote and prefer perverted sexual desires and activities such as intimate relations between humans and dogs, cats and barnyard animals, sexual relations that mimic sexual intercourse between humans of the same sex, and adult humans that prefer sexual intercourse with children, or other such perverted types of preferences are a serious threat to the decency,

health, moral and spiritual integrity of this land.

To support those that have sexual preferences by government mandate, I believe, will have an encouraging and strengthening effect on these perverse ideas and activities. I believe that government support will spread sexual perversion to more people, and that especially the young will become victim to these destructive forces. Because of the obvious relationship of the spread of the AIDS disease to the practice of the homosexual perversion, I believe that this killing disease will spread even faster if the government supports preferential sexual perversion.

I own and operate a business, and seriously intend to maintain a workplace where I, my friends, and employees can

continue with the freedom from being exposed to frequent or close contact with those who have the perverted and evil sexual preferences that have been briefly mentioned.

As one that has received Jesus Christ as my lord and savior, I know that just as Jesus Christ has forgiven my sins, so can he forgive those who have reached the depths of the sin of sexual perversion. The key is a repentant heart toward God, and in truth, believing in, and receiving Jesus Christ as savior and lord. But for those in perversion to continue therein, and for our government and people to seek the perverse way, must lead to more confusion and destruction.

James Ashlin  
North Bend

## COMMENTARY

# Did reviewer have ax to grind with Robin Hood?

By Amy Hulse and Rebecca Porisch

What movie did Lucas J. Gutman see for his review of *Robin Hood: Prince of Thieves*? (*ODE*, June 18.)

There are many discrepancies between this review and the actual movie. Gutman suspiciously echoes Gene Siskel and Roger Ebert. Gutman, along with Siskel and Ebert, has a lot to learn about how to enjoy a movie.

Gutman's false assertions are pretty incredible, and must stem from the same dim-witted, pseudo-intellectual attitude that Siskel and Ebert bring to their weekly reviews. For example, the "violence" was not excessive, especially for such a period film. How else would medieval nobleman fight in the era of the crusades? Fists just wouldn't match up to swords and arrows. The "violence" is realistic, not gory, and never overdone. Nobody was beheaded in this movie — did Gutman imagine this? Or did he see Rambo Robin or the Terminator of Sherwood?

Gutman would also lead us to believe this movie is laden with overly-dark scenes. The darkness in the movie adds to the mood and to the realism. "Hey," Mr. Gutman says, "put some windows in that dungeon! That'll look real authentic."

Another glaring mistake in Gutman's statement is that "Robin's status as prince means nothing now and the sheriff has branded him an outlaw with a big price

on his head."

First of all, Robin Hood was not a prince. He was the son of a rich man, known as a lord in those days. It takes a king to make a prince. Secondly, the price the sheriff put on Robin's head was not so big in the beginning. It grows as the sheriff's anger and frustration grow.

*Robin Hood* is not *Dances With Wolves*. Costner did not direct *Robin Hood*, nor did he have as much time to complete the movie. Yet even though *Robin Hood* was filmed in 16 weeks, the producers did a damn good job at making the movie convincing, well-filmed, entertaining and a satisfying addition to the Robin Hood legend.

The story takes place in the year 1194, and people of 800 years ago didn't joyfully romp through magical forests in green tights. Men were not "merry," as the saying goes, and the band of refugees who escaped the heavy-handed rule of the Sheriff of Nottingham were not "oafish, vile ... and contemptible." The people of Medieval England rarely had clean clothes or pearly white teeth and their only major forms of entertainment were mead and family life. If this makes the common people of 1194 "vile" and "contemptible" then Gutman needs his head examined.

*Robin Hood: Prince of Thieves* is exciting and robust, definitely a new and more realistic look at a myth that is more than 800 years old. If Gutman and other narrow-minded critics want to whine and complain

about accents in the movie, then they might as well request that all the characters speak in Middle English and the director use subtitles. Costner never attempts an English accent; he merely tones down our own American accent. It is consistent throughout the movie and doesn't distract from the story or the action.

The characters in this movie have depth and reality. The audience empathizes with their fear, we thrill with their love, we feel their frustration. Robin Hood himself is no longer just a one-dimensional goody-two-shoes in green tights. He has doubts, he didn't expect to fall in love. He is a man who has grown up, yet has a lot more to learn about himself and others.

Azeem (Morgan Freeman) becomes a loyal friend; like many Arabs of the age, he dabbles a bit in the sciences. Marian (Mary Elizabeth Mastrantonio) has more guts than the average maiden, and she must re-learn to trust those who seemed to have deserted her. Little John (Nick Brimble) is a family man and fears for their safety. He and others are inspired by Robin's good intentions to revolt against the sheriff.

*Robin Hood* is a myth. Myths are retold constantly, and this is just one way it might have happened. Those who realize this can enjoy such movies, and those who refuse to accept it are going to miss out on something special. May self-absorbed critics like Gutman have a nice trip as they fall off their high horse.

Amy Hulse and Rebecca Porisch are students at the University.

