Look at whole picture

Stephanie Sisson's column, "Earth will adjust to catastrophes" (ODE, Jan. 11) offers hope to everyone wanting to ignore any hint of an environmental crisis. There's good news: Regardless of human folly, "our planet will survive."

Of course Venus survives as a planet, too, so this raises the question as to the quality of life that accompanies such "survival."

If Sisson's "survival" includes the abundant diversi-

ty that comprises the Earth's web of ecosystems, then she exposes an ignorance and an arrogance in her complacent supposition that these systems are able to endure under the demand of human "progress," and that we, as a species, have insufficient power to radically disrupt that balance.

Sisson rightly asserts that the Earth will adapt to our efforts. Of that there is no question. There is, however, a significant question as to what will be lost in the dramatic change that accompanies such adaptation. Extinction doesn't heal.

Sisson counsels that "fear can make us too cautious," but let me offer that ignorance and shallow trust have far greater consequences. Humanity is not necessarily the enemy of the Earth, but if we continue to downplay the impact of our "progress" by isolating the catastrophes instead of examining the values of the systems that produce them, far more will be lost than natural cleansing processes could possibly restore.

Destroying the sustainability of our natural habitat makes us not the enemy of the Earth, but the enemy of ourselves. It is our technological potency that makes the consequences of that oblivious, self-destruction so

Daniel Macke Eugene

Make packets worth cost

Professors have promoted the use of packets, alleging it adds special substance to their courses. Now packets cost as much as pocket textbooks — \$18 unassembled for my political science course. Don't expect refinements in packets, such as an alphabetical index at the end

But at least packets should contain a table of contents. It's horrendous pouring through a packet to find scheduled reading. Professors overlook this, and the Campus Copy Center doesn't care. Let's have minimum standards for packets, including table of contents pages. Otherwise dispense with packets.

H. Johnston Postgraduate Political Science

Some simple suggestions

To make my life on this campus a healthier place to be, I submit the following requests:

1) If you carry an umbrella when it is raining, please be considerate. I am tired of dodging to save my eye-



balls

2) If you wish to converse in the library, please do so in a subdued tone of voice. I enjoy running into people too, but the library is primarily a place of study.

 Please be polite and forgiving if I violate your existence by accident. We all need time to learn how to be better humans.

George Campbell Eugene

OSPIRG donates money

Wednesday afternoon. OSPIRG's Hunger and Homeless group presented Eugene Emergency Housing with a check for \$800. This money will go toward meeting current shelter needs at the Eugene Family Shelter.

The money will pay for 32 nights of shelter, which includes more than just a place to stay. Families staying at the shelter will receive meals, clothes, counseling services if needed, assistance with job hunting and, most of all, help looking for a place to live.

This money was raised through proceeds from the Faith No More concert Jan. 17 and through private donations. If you have any questions or would like more information about this, you may contact us at 246.4277

Perry Pepper OSPIRG

Abortion argument falls flat

In response to Bob Weigel's letter titled "Abortion wrong; no argument" (ODE, Jan. 20), he's absolutely

correct. There is no argument. Let us explain.

Weigel attempted "to share the responses" to a previous letter he had written on abortion. Excuse us, but where were the responses and what were the respondents really trying to say? The only point Weigel made with his "clear line of reasoning" is "a few people said it was a good letter."

Also, what "same thing in their minds" was Weigel referring to? Hello?

We think Weigel has put on an "impressive front" by ultimately confusing anyone who seriously attempts to understand his "clear line of reasoning." We have read his third paragraph/run-on sentence many times and think we know what he's trying to say ... but maybe we should do lunch (then again, maybe not).

We are open to consider and engage others' views, even if they differ from our own, but the arguments must be built on a foundation and the reasoning must be clear. We have decided his attempt to reason has primarily confused your readers and thus has failed.

No one can say what another is thinking. Weigel has accused those who disagree with his "clear line of reasoning" of hating, which implies he knows how they feel and what they think. It's impossible to decipher the unexpressed thoughts of others — therefore discarding the opinions of those who oppose his as ignorant.

Weigel should open his mind, polish his thoughts, and others will listen.

Shannon Greer Biology Peter Shair Geology

