

## Look out Oregon, here comes California

Oregonians' prejudice against people from California reflects their own ignorance and fear over what they see as a threat to the entire state of Oregon.

**H**ill! My name is Nicole Kristal. I'm 19 years old, and I'm a Californian. And, of course, now you can infer that I'm superficial, competitive, impersonal, unfriendly and completely unconcerned about the environment. One of my favorite pastimes is bitching about the miserable weather and the rain — because, of course, I live on a warm, sunny beach. Oh, and did I mention that I have blonde hair, too?

Sorry for the biting sarcasm, but I hope I made my point: Oregonians unfairly stereotype Californians. I, for one, am incredibly tired of it. But not all Oregonians carry this deep-seated prejudice. I'm smart enough not to make foolish generalizations about an entire state.

Before I moved here to attend the University, Californians told me that most Oregon residents and business employees would bend over backwards to help me. Unfortunately, almost every time one of these friendly public servants asks to see my driver's license, their delightful attitude becomes unpleasant and condescending. At Food Value, the Eugene Public Library and a number of other stores and establishments, I have experienced this sort of prejudice.

Last winter, I wrote an editorial in which I made the mistake of mentioning that the bay area is "socially advanced." In a letter to the editor, I was labeled "Oregonophobic." I also received a nasty telephone call from three girls who yelled, "If you don't like it here, go back to California!" However, if you heard of Hispanics having pride in their Californian homeland, you wouldn't hear people yell, "Go back to Mexico!" unless they were completely racist.

Last winter, I was walking home after class with a fellow student. He was wearing shorts and the weather was rather cold. I asked if he was cold. He said, "No, this isn't cold. All those damn Californians can't take the cold.... You're from Boston, right?" Wrong.

But for some reason Oregonians believe that all Californians "deserve" to be the target of these attacks. This prejudice against Californians is com-



CHRIS HUTCHINSON/Emerald

pletely acceptable to most Oregonians I know.

Glenn Tsunokai, a University of California at Riverside doctoral student in sociology, conducted a survey last November about the deep-seated prejudices Oregonians have against Californians. Tsunokai used the questions from a survey used to measure prejudice against blacks and homosexuals and substituted the word "Californians."

He found that 68 percent of Oregonians think Californians cause negative changes in their communities. According to the study, Oregonians view Californians as shallow, ruthless and competitive — not to mention superficial, calculating and impersonal.

Oregonians describe themselves as charitable, trustworthy, law-abiding, considerate and neighborly. (Funny, those weren't the first words that popped into my head.) According to the Oregonians polled in the survey, 53 percent believe Oregon's environment will deteriorate as more Californians move into the state. The fact that such a broad assumption exists is disappointing and frightening.

California is a diverse state. Last time I visited, I saw license plates from all over the country — even Oregon. Surprisingly enough, no one was complaining about those "damn" Oregonians being in

our state, driving slowly on the freeways and sitting in their cars at gas stations waiting to be served.

I simply do not understand this prejudice. While research has been done to prove that Oregonians foolishly hate Californians, no evidence exists to prove that this prejudice is justifiable.

In life there are good people and there are bad people. There are greedy people and generous people. One cannot assume that the person's place of origin determines what type of person that person is. Stereotyping and generalizations make threatened people feel safe.

But as far as in-migration is concerned, Oregonians might as well accept the fact that large numbers of Californians as well as Washingtonians are moving to Oregon because they have not control over it.

Californians aren't going to leave the state just because they encounter a little attitude. Oregonians can only make themselves appear threatened, insecure and immature by pushing this prejudice on every Californian they meet.

*Nicole Kristal is a columnist for the Emerald. Her views do not necessarily reflect those of the newspaper. E-mail: nkristal@gladstone.uoregon.edu.*

### OPINION



Nicole Kristal

### LETTERS

#### Unreal hypotheticals

I am writing in response to Jade Forrest Rubick's letter about the Sexual Misconduct Code (ODE, May 28). Rubick erroneously stated that the code said students who have sex in family housing and students who don't do their homework because they're too busy kissing are committing acts of sexual violence.

As someone who helped draft the code, I would like to correct Rubick. Students who have sex in family housing aren't committing acts of sexual violence; students who rape or sexually assault someone in family housing are. And I could care less how two people choose to spend their time unless one of them is being raped or sexually assaulted.

I'm not sure what possessed Rubick to think that these two hypotheticals fell under the jurisdiction of the code. Even more confusing is the fact that sexual assault occurring on University-owned or controlled property or that affects a person's academic performance was punishable under the old code. The new code does not change these things; what it does do is clearly define rape and sexual assault.

The other major change is that rape and sexual assault are defined as occurring when both parties do not consent to the sex-

ual act. Consent means if you're not sure, find out. This is plain common sense. Common sense, by the way, should have told Jade Forrest Rubick that healthy relationships are not punishable under the sexual misconduct code.

Mandi Hood  
Co-chair  
Student Conduct Code Committee

#### Code protects

Classic scenario. A woman goes out with a friend, drinks a little, and ends up not feeling so well. She passes out and awakes to find her body being violated. She says no; she makes attempts to regain control, but the violence against her continues. This happened two weekends ago to a female student off-campus by a male University student, and in reality, it happens every weekend.

This classic scenario is precisely the reason for the Student Sexual Conduct Code changes. Under the old code, this student had no recourse because it was off-campus, and there was little resistance to force. Now we have a code that protects people in incapacitated states. We now have language that protects all students and the surrounding community.

There have been arguments that the code takes away a student's right to get drunk and

have sex. What it truly takes away is the ambiguity of consent and the complications of alcohol. We have protected our students on-campus and off. We have begun to take responsibility. We are adults now, and we must be accountable for our actions.

To the survivor of this crime: we apologize; we sympathize, and we want you to know you have the support of the ASUO and the University behind you. We also want you to know you have recourse not only in the legal system, but the University as well.

To the media: the purpose of this code has been ridiculed and mocked with jokes of consent forms and questions of purpose. You did not try to represent the truth; you tried to scare and scandalize. The manner in which these changes were explained was irresponsible and unprofessional.

To the readers of this letter: it's time to take responsibility for our sexual practices. If that seems like too much to ask, then think of this woman or a woman being hurt who you love. Think of a wife, a sister, a mother and reevaluate.

Cassandra Lautenschleger  
ASUO Safety Advocate  
Bill Miner  
ASUO President  
Ben Unger  
ASUO Vice President

### Correction

The story on the ASUO Executive on page four of the June 1 *Emerald* should have read that ASUO President Bill Miner and Vice President Ben Unger changed the title of Non-Traditional Student Advocate to Outreach Director because the person chosen for the job is not a non-traditional student. The *Emerald* regrets the error.

### WINNERS

**PAULA JONES**  
The Supreme Court ruled that Jones has a right to take the President to court on charges of sexual harassment.

**MICHAEL JORDAN**  
Jordan proved he is still the king of the court Sunday, nailing a last second jumper to win the first game of the Bulls-Jazz series in the NBA finals.

**REBECCA SEALFON**  
The 13-year-old Brooklyn resident won the National Spelling Bee with her correct spelling of the word "eunonym."

**AIDS PATIENTS**  
President Clinton announced he will propose having Medicaid cover the cost of medication for low-income patients infected with the virus that causes AIDS.

### LOSERS

**JOE CAMEL**  
The Federal Trade Commission ruled that the lovable camel is geared at kids and will move to ban the campaign.

**MARTHA STEWART**  
Stewart is subject to charges of pinning a construction worker with her car for building a fence by her home.

**TIM ALLEN**  
The "Home Improvement" star was charged with drunken driving after being clocked at 70 mph in his Ferrari.

**MARY SLANEY**  
The Eugene-resident track star was suspended suspended from competition by the International Amateur Athletic Federation for her alleged drug use.