

New NCAA standards mean better students

Seven years ago, the NCAA instituted Proposition 48, which toughened the standards for incoming freshman wanting to play intercollegiate athletics. Last week, the committee took the long-awaited second step in putting the "student" back in student-athlete.

Beginning in 1995, freshman will be required to have a 2.0 GPA and a 900 SAT score, or a 2.5 GPA and a 700 SAT. In addition, students will have to complete 13 high school core classes. Right now, Prop 48 demands a 2.0, a 700 SAT and 11 completed core courses.

The tough standards have understandably upset some people. They charge racism on the totally accurate claim of disproportionate school funding between upper-middle class (usually white) neighborhoods and poverty-level (mostly minority) ones.

But by labeling the new NCAA standards as racist, and thus dismissing them on that basis, is no solution. The NCAA is truly trying to upgrade its image. Currently, intercollegiate athletics appear to be little more than minor leagues for the NBA and NFL. By stiffening entrance requirements, the NCAA is hoping to get more true students on the playing fields, and force the ones already there to take their studies more seriously.

As a comparison to past NCAA accomplishments, one needs to look no farther than Prop 48. There are many who have been forced to sit out a year because of academics, only to go on to success not only in athletics, but off the field as well. Georgetown's Dikembe Mutombo, Cal-Berkeley's Russell White, and closer to home, Terrell Brandon, are but a few Prop 48's who have gone on to better things.

But the NCAA cannot stop at entrance requirements. By the time student-athletes get to the college gates, the damage of inequitable schooling has already been done. The NCAA, if truly committed to helping students — all students — must go into the high schools, lobby Congress for equality in schooling and spread some of the vast television revenues around.

In short, the NCAA must do what many individuals have already started. The power of the NCAA can be a great help if used properly.

And let's hope it doesn't take another seven years for the NCAA to act.

By stiffening entrance requirements, the NCAA is hoping to get more true students on the playing fields, and force the ones already there to take their studies more seriously.

LETTERS POLICY

Letters to the editor must be limited to no more than 250 words, legible, signed and the identification of the writer must be verified when the letter is submitted.

Oregon Daily Emerald

P.O. BOX 3198, EUGENE, OREGON 97403

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published daily Monday through Friday during the school year and Tuesday and Thursday during the summer by the Oregon Daily Emerald Publishing Co. Inc., at the University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

The Emerald operates independently of the University with offices at Suite 300 of the Erb Memorial Union and is a member of the Associated Press.

The Emerald is private property. The unlawful removal or use of papers is prosecutable by law.

Managing Editor	Editor in Chief : Christopher Blair	News Editor	Chris Bounieff
Editorial Editor	Pat Malach	Sports Editor	Don Peters
Graphics Editor	Cathie Daniels	Editorial Editor	Jake Berg
Entertainment Editor	Jeff Paslay	Night Editor	Don Peters
Associate Editors	Layne Lakelish		
Student Government/Activities	Daralyn Trappe	Community	Rene DeCair
Higher Education/Administration	Carrie Dennett	Features	Lisa Millegan
Reporters	Tammy Batey, David Charbonneau, Karen Engels, Jayson Jacoby, Gerrit Koeppling, Kirsten Lucias, Hope Neilson, Colleen Pohlig		
Copy Editors	Dan Eisler, Karen Engels, Fred Hagen, Paul Halvorson, Sheila Mitha, Kathy Sherlock		
Photographers	Sean Poston, Andre Ransier		
Advertising	Jean Bradley, Scott Dana, Leslie Flax, David Gauntlett, Britan Kilburn, Tom Leach, Randon Riley, Catherine Royle, Dustin Stadler, Tara Sumatt, Vicki Tobin, Sharon Vaz		
Classified	Peggy McGinn, Manager, Kevin Austerman, Alan Curtis, Sheila Lorenzo		
Business	Kathy Carbone, Supervisor, Judy Connolly		
Production	Ingrid White, Production Coordinator, Sarah Clark, Corne Frier, Kristine Granger, Susan Head, Jennifer Huey, Dee McCobb, Stacy Mitchell, Matt Morin, Jennifer Roland, Jennifer Smith, Anne Stephenson, Jennifer Viare, Todd Williams		



OPINION

'Playboy' today, Malcolm X next?



THE FINE PRINT

BY PAT MALACH

The battle to remove *Playboy* and *Penthouse* from the University Bookstore is being waged yet again.

At a public meeting on Jan. 16 the University Bookstore Board of Directors heard comments on both sides of the issue. The move to yank the magazines from the bookstore's shelves was brought to life by the University's own Men Against Rape because of its belief that the material in the magazines leads to the "objectification and debasement of women," which in turn creates more violence against women.

Facts and figures were thrown out by advocates on both sides of the debate. There were several emotional testimonials of sexual abuse and exploitation and the deep physical and emotional scars those traumas can leave for survivors.

Anyone in attendance had to come away with a clearer perception that violence against women in our society is more common than they may have originally believed.

The petitioners made convincing arguments that violence against women is something this country needs to attack with a sincere vigor. The cause is a good one and the people committed to finding a solution should continue in their efforts to educate the masses.

But, they did not make a strong enough case to justify censoring the magazines from the store. Yes, I said censor, because it is censorship. No matter how forcefully and emotionally the removal advocates may have stated their case, what else can you call it when one group wants material they find offensive removed from the view of the rest of society?

Those people seeking the removal of the magazines from the bookstore need to step back from this particular event and extend their logic to other issues.

The removal advocates believe *Playboy* and *Penthouse* cause harm to women and this justifies the censorship.

But what if a group of students approached the board and asked them not to sell any literature concerning Malcolm X because of his radical views. Malcolm X is a man very easy to admire because of his strength and integrity in the face of staggering odds, and his commitment to never backing down from the truth.

True, he mellowed a bit after his pilgrimage to Mecca and his realization that "a blanket indictment of all white people is as wrong as when whites make blanket indictments against blacks." But for 12 years prior to this, Malcolm X firmly believed and taught that "the white man is the devil." (*The Autobiography of Malcolm X*).

Malcolm X-removal advocates could convincingly argue his early message — if acted upon — is harmful to whites because it could provoke violent outbursts among the oppressed.

That argument could be made just as powerfully as the anti-*Playboy/Penthouse* one. Should anything containing Malcolm X's message be forbidden from bookstore's shelves?

The Oregon Citizen's Alliance continually misconstrues the message of the Bible to justify its campaign of intolerance against the lesbian and gay communities. In 1988, the OCA was instrumental in passing an initiative rescinding Governor Goldschmidt's executive order prohibiting job discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. At this very moment, the OCA is using the Bible as the foundation for its attempt to pass laws forbidding recognizing gays and lesbians as having equal rights under the law. This certainly causes harm to that community.

So, should we ban the Bible from the bookstore because one small group is negatively affected by it?

The same argument can be made by Palestinians against the teachings of Judaism, and by Jews against the book of Islam.

In the pages of the *Emerald* on Jan. 15, University student Eric Ward wrote that "Neither

the Bill of Rights nor the Constitution has ever been protectorates of the Black people ... the majority of blacks are still suffering from the mental and physical abuses of white supremacy — better known as the United States."

If the Constitution and the Bill of Rights aid in the oppression of blacks, should they be banned from the University Bookstore?

One way to test the soundness of any argument is to put its logic in a different context. If it still holds water, and still has consistently good results, it is probably a good argument. If it doesn't, then you probably should abandon it.

One argument used to link the two magazines to violence against women uses the statistic that 75 percent of serial killers and rapists view pornography. In no way is this proof of a cause-and-effect relationship because it blatantly ignores the remaining percentage of people who view pornography.

In their 1983 book, *The Child Lovers*, researchers Glenn D. Wilson and David N. Cox, found that 71 percent of the male pedophiles they studied preferred young boys. Using the logic from the argument above, you must conclude that homosexuality leads to pedophilia.

If you find that assumption offensive, then you must find the pornography-leads-to-sexual-abuse conclusion equally offensive because both rely on the same logic to reach their conclusions.

Once again, you can't practice your logic in a vacuum, or only when it is useful to your chosen point of view. If it stands in one context, it should stand when applied to any situation.

Those supporting the removal of *Playboy* and *Penthouse* have not looked beyond this particular case to examine the larger issue at hand. That's why they didn't make a convincing argument Jan. 16. It is also why they can't make the statement that this is not an issue of censorship when it clearly is.

Pat Malach is managing editor of the *Emerald*.