

PERSPECTIVES

Editor in chief: Jack Clifford
 Managing Editor: Jessica Blanchard
 Newsroom: (541) 346-5511
 Room 300, Erb Memorial Union
 P.O. box 3159, Eugene, OR 97403
 E-mail: ode@oregon.uoregon.edu

EDITORIAL EDITOR: MICHAEL J. KLECKNER opeditor@journalist.com

PFC, the cowardly LION

The Programs Finance Committee is one of the most important aspects of student government. By overseeing and determining the outcome of the budget process for all ASUO student programs, the PFC maintains student control of millions of dollars in student incidental fees every year.

Or at least it did until Tuesday night, when the PFC voted to approve The Insurgent's budget but put it in a holding account until questions about the independent newspaper's December issue could be answered. With this decision — ostensibly made to keep the process moving — the PFC showed a lack of courage and threatened

student control of student money.

Questions about The Insurgent surfaced recently, when concerned people started calling ASUO President Jay Breslow about the newspaper's decision to publish the Animal Liberation Front's primer — an explanation of that underground group's philosophy and a step-by-step guide to arson, breaking and entering, vandalism and

A.L.F. primer.

What the PFC members overlooked, however, is that it is not their mission to determine whether the printing was ethical, responsible or legal. Their charge is to examine the budgets and the mission statements of student groups and determine whether the groups contribute to the "cultural and physical enhancement of the

sabotage.

At The Insurgent's PFC budget hearing, the issue of whether it was responsible and legal to print such material became the primary concern of the PFC members. As the Emerald editorial board previously opined, we don't believe it was a responsible decision to print what could be interpreted as an incitement to commit crimes. We think it was a mistake to print contact information for University animal researchers in the same issue — and on a page facing the

University."

The PFC did approve The Insurgent's budget and the group's mission statement. After much discussion, the members of the committee even seemed to admit that The Insurgent did enhance the University. Their final concern, as expressed by member Aaron Weck's motion, was that if The Insurgent is sued over the publication of the A.L.F. primer or the researchers' contact information, such suits could open the University, the ASUO and the student incidental fee to lawsuits as well. Whether a lawsuit against The Insurgent would be successful is completely unknown. No one present at the PFC meeting had that knowledge. If a lawsuit was successful, would it open the incidental fee to lawsuits? Again, no one at the meeting knew for sure.

The important point is that we believe, as Insurgent collective member Willie Thompson expressed forcefully and repeatedly, that the PFC has no authority to determine the legality of any specific content produced by any specific student program. The PFC's job is to either approve the program's budget or not, as a whole, based on

criteria other than content.

The Emerald would certainly not want the PFC to argue over the acceptability of ideas expressed in our paper, nor in any other student publication. Whether those ideas are legal or not, or acceptable or not, is a matter for higher bodies to decide — such as the Student Senate or state and federal courts.

By acting to cover its ass instead of acting as a decision-making body, the PFC exposed the student fee process to the judgment of the University administration. What a chilling effect, indeed, on free speech if University President Dave Frohnmayer's legal counsel decides that student money cannot be given to a student group because that group's content is offensive.

The PFC process is confusing and can seem arbitrary to those outside student government. Making such an impotent decision, instead of exerting the power that the PFC does have, surely does nothing to reassure students that their millions of dollars are being allocated fairly.

This editorial represents the opinion of the Emerald editorial board. Responses can be sent to ode@oregon.uoregon.edu.

Needed: Men to help destroy male power

GUEST COMMENTARY

Lucas Spiegel

Starting today and running through the weekend, there will be a conference for men and women at the University of Oregon titled, "Against Patriarchy: a step toward the abolition of male privilege." I know a lot of men are threatened by the concept of rejecting their privilege. These men need to ask themselves where this privilege comes from and how others are affected by it.

By its very definition, a privilege or power granted to one person or group requires the disempowerment of another person or group. No one can have an advantage without someone else having a disadvantage. In the case of sexism and patriarchy, it is men who are granted power and privilege. Therefore, it is men who bear the responsibility of rejecting that privilege and starting to level the playing field. This conference is not about blaming all men for the existence of sexism and male privilege; it is rather about helping men take responsibility for the privileges an unfair system has granted them. Let me share the mission statement of the conference.

A movement towards the elimination of male privilege, domination, and sexism. Striving to create dialogue, educate ourselves and each other, and inspire action.

- What is patriarchy, and how does it affect each of us?
- What are the practices and results of male privilege, domination and sexism?

- How do we identify male privilege?
- What does it mean to be a man or woman in this culture?
- How does this gender polarization limit us?
- If we could get outside of these roles, what kind of people would we like to be?
- How does male domination connect to other oppressions, such as racism, heterosexism, ableism, classism, capitalism, government and speciesism?
- How do we go about answering these questions?

The aim of this conference is to focus directly upon patriarchy and our roles within it. Through presentation, dialogue and performance, we hope to broach these questions seriously and playfully, with intellect and emotion. The goal is an increased understanding of our society and how we might change it and ourselves for the better.

To reject, we must identify, understand and fight.

The conference, being held in Grayson Hall, kicks off this evening at 5 p.m. in Room 240C with an introduction, followed by a performance and workshop by the Young Women's Theater Collective. The conference continues all day Saturday and Sunday in Grayson Hall. It is free and open to the public. I hope that people of all genders come with open minds, ready to challenge the patriarchy found in all of our society's institutions of power, which has taken root in our minds and hearts. It's time to rock the boat!

Please visit www.fruitiondesign.com/againstpatriarchy or stop by Grayson Hall any time this weekend.

Lucas Spiegel is a member of the AP Collective.

Letters to the editor

Education should come first

If the University persists and prevails in the Autzen-WISTEC parking controversy, then I've instructed the Alumni Association to take me off the list for future solicitations for cash and support.

I've got nothing against the University sports program, but when a so-called institution of higher education gets heavy-handed on behalf of football over a community science and education center — one that benefits possible future University students — well, that's not right.

Mitch Hider
journalism
class of '70

Sports valued over schooling

I was stunned to discover that the University of Oregon, with the help

of Eugene's City Council, has decided that football outweighs science education in the Willamette Valley.

As a former employee of both the University and WISTEC, I have a unique perspective. Both organizations were founded with education in mind. Somewhere along the line, the University chose, instead, to provide minor-league training to the NFL and the NBA. I suppose we're fortunate that major league baseball pays for its minor leagues.

I left the University three years ago to become director of a planetarium in North Carolina. Here, people understand that a science museum is a major part of their children's education. Is Eugene's reputedly forward-thinking City Council incapable of seeing WISTEC's value?

Take this quote from City Council member Gary Papé: In an article ("Autzen expansion approved,

might force WISTEC to close," ODE, Jan. 23), he said, "I think WISTEC would be miles ahead if they went out knocking on doors and doing the hard work we all do (to fundraise)." At least one City Council member has absolutely no idea how hard it is to keep a museum going.

It's obvious that with the ongoing expansion of University athletics, the Leo Harris Parkway region will run out of space within the next 10 years. Why not move the stadium to a more appropriate and accessible location?

Eugene and the University have a reputation for being forward thinking. Don't kill that reputation for the sake of a few more nosebleed seats.

James C. Craig
director, James H. Lynn Planetarium
Schiele Museum of Natural History
Gastonia, NC

Left Field

by Frank Silva

