

Residents try to lick Lollipops in protest

Freedom of choice is once again the hot topic in Eugene. Protesters from both sides of the issue have taken to the street, picketing outside a building, both in favor of and opposed to the choices being made by the women inside. As usual, those opposed denounced what was happening in the building as the result of society's permissiveness and a moral outrage. And as usual, the pro-choice side declared that a woman has the right to decide what she will do with her body.

What isn't usual is that the topic of these recent protests has not been *Roe v. Wade*, but rather the opening of Lollipops, a topless nightclub that caters to the 18-and-over crowd.

Lollipops is located next door to Eugene's home of "Harmless Visual Stimuli." Jiggles, located at West 11th Avenue and Garfield Street. Lollipops, or Jiggles Jr. as it may soon come to be known, offers topless dancing just like Jiggles Sr., but serves no alcohol.

Since opening day, protesters have been out in force. They claim topless dancing is not "harmless visual stimuli" but rather a form of violence against women. They even cite government reports that "prove" nude dancing and other forms of sexual entertainment are directly responsible for crimes against women. Never mind that the reports were produced by the illustrious and completely objective (or is that objectionable) Senator Jesse Helms, that great advocate of a woman's right to choose. Simply put, they do not believe that women should have the right to dance topless.



Meanwhile, with the other face, many of the activists probably continue to support a woman's right to choose an abortion. After all, they say, it is her body and no one, particularly men, should be able to tell her what she can and cannot do with it. Apparently though, it is OK for a woman to tell another woman what she cannot do with her body.

The dancers argue that what they do is art, and as any liberal arts student can tell you, art is purely subjective. Just ask Robert Maplethorpe, or the members of Two-Live-Crew. Or perhaps better yet, what about Karen Finley, the performance artist who smears her nude body (breasts exposed) with simulated feces as part of her act. Some people consider it art. Whatever it is, it is certainly no more decadent than topless dancing.

And the irony doesn't stop there. Did the protesters realize that their actions would result in loads of free publicity for both clubs? Imagine what it would have cost to purchase air time on all three local broadcast stations, the *Oregonian* and the front page of the *Register-Guard*. Yet that is exactly what the clubs received thanks to the people who want to close them down.

And what about freedom of expression? The Oregon Supreme Court has ruled that Oregon's constitution protects all forms of speech, even those found to be obscene. The only time the state can take an interest in obscenity is when it affects minors, and minors cannot get into Jiggles Jr.

Eighteen is an age when virtually the entire adult world becomes open to young adults. They can vote, enter a contract, register for the draft, fight a war (and maybe even get killed). Now, for residents of Eugene, those activities include seeing topless women dance.

Gasp, the horror of it all.

If the schizophrenic crusaders outside Lollipops and Jiggles want to do something constructive, they should put their energy and efforts into providing alternative forms of entertainment.

Topless dancing is as responsible for violence against women as Ozzy Osbourne's *Suicide Solution* is responsible for suicide. Both are easy scapegoats for those afraid of attacking the underlying causes of the problems.



OPINION

Family values and other discounts

THE FINE PRINT

By Pat Malach



Political campaigns have always been a linguist's equivalent of an amusement park. They seem to magically turn the English language into a new and exciting form of communication.

From a president who doesn't understand the crucial role verbs play in a sentence, to political consultants who tell us spin is not necessarily something involved in most carnival rides, campaigns thrive on a dialect all their own.

This year's campaign is no different. And the hands-down winner for phrase of the '92 presidential campaign is "family values."

Unfortunately, so many of these political folks have put different spins on what the term is supposed to entail, it has truly lost all meaning. Coming from a blue-collar family with six children, the family value I most remember is that the people who ate the fastest had the best chance for seconds on pork chop night.

After hearing the number of times FVs were mentioned by the Republicans at their recent convention, an understanding of just what FVs are is an essential part of making an informed decision this November.

Sitting at a table in front of the EMU, sharing a bag of nachos and salsa, students James Hodge and Hutch Tibbets said they weren't quite sure what the "family values" talk was all about.

"I think we should just think about it in terms of human values," Hodge said.

"Then the GOP is shot to hell," interrupted Tibbets.

Senior Marilyn Mitchell had a clearer picture. "I think family values are when there's a mom and dad in the family."

University graduate Christine White said she believes family values are about children.

"When mom and dad are working all day, and kids don't see them all day, a lot of times that's necessary," she said. "But a lot of times it's just be-

cause success goes with a career-oriented world, and kids are forgotten more."

To graduate student Trish Lawrence, family values are a means of support.

"(Family values) mean hanging together, whether it's family or friends, just having people to go to when you're in trouble."

To really solve this mystery, we'll have to go straight to the horses mouth. Or, in this case, the jackass. After analyzing the behavior of prominent Republicans, I'm beginning to understand what family values are to the GOP.

First of all, lie, lie, lie.

Richard Bond started the ball rolling with his overly simplistic characterization of a complex legal opinion written by Hillary Clinton 10 years ago. The GOP chairman's fictional interpretation was so ludicrous it can only accurately be described as an outright lie.

Obviously, Bond was raised by his Republican family to believe the truth is inconsequential in the face of getting your candidate re-elected.

Second, never, ever let your principles and moral beliefs get in the way of your political ambitions. George Bush has perfected this one. Once upon a time, George was a pro-choice politician. Then, in an incredible bit of personal courage (and coincidental timing), he had a moral change of heart just in time to be included on Ronald Reagan's anti-abortion ticket. What luck.

That same year, he had a similar change of heart and was able to embrace Reagan's economic plan, the same plan he had referred to as "voodoo economics" months earlier.

Another of my favorite Republican family values is the ability to take credit for other people's accomplishments and blame other people for their own shortcomings. For example: The Eastern Bloc fell, not because of the heroic efforts of hundreds of thousands of brave citizens who finally just said "NO," the U.S. Republican Party did it. And the suffocating economy is not the fault of a do-nothing administration, it's that damn "liberal Congress."

But the most touching display of family values in recent times had to be those of Neil Bush. Neil is my candidate for

Bond was raised by his Republican family to believe the truth is inconsequential in the face of getting your candidate re-elected.

Mr. Family Values of the 1990s. First, Neil used his family name to get appointed to an influential position on the board of directors of Colorado's failed Silverado Savings and Loan.

Then, after approving loans to people who used the money to invest in his own company, Neil, in a beautiful gesture of family selflessness, put his \$400,000-plus home in his wife's name.

Cynics might suggest he did this because he knew his dealings at Silverado were improper, and assets in his wife's name would be protected from confiscation.

But that's just a negative spin typical of the gloom and doomers. Neil was simply displaying those fine values taught to him by his father, and our current president.

Those same family values that were taught to Neil are ever-present in our political leader today. Bush is the same president who, along with our draft-dodging Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney, shot down legislation that would have kept married military couples with children from serving in combat zones at the same time.

And, as Anthony Lewis wrote in a column for the *New York Times*, it was George who vetoed a bill that would have required large companies to give employees unpaid family and medical leave.

I hope this stroll down Family Values Lane has been as instructional for you as it has been for me. And this November, when punching your presidential ballot, remember not to get suckered by what these political hucksters say. Instead, look at the family values they have shown us via their actions.

Pat Malach is editor of the Emerald.