

Without athletics, it isn't education

By Rick Obritschkewitsch
Of The Print

All through high school, students are told by their guidance counselors that they should get a well rounded education. Not just academically, but also through some sort of extracurricular activities, and perhaps even a job.

But with what's been happening recently, the extracurricular activities, or at least athletics, don't seem too important to the colleges and universities anymore.

The four state-funded, four-year Oregon colleges are considering cutting out all inter-collegiate athletic activities to balance their budgets, and the University of Oregon has already cut its baseball program.

What has happened to the well rounded education? Is the academic portion all that's im-

portant now in the educational system?

What's going to happen to the students who have no escape from the academic grind? There are many college students who, if there wasn't an inter-collegiate sports program, would simply go to their classes, do their homework, and go to work with no time out for any real recreation. Sure, there are PE classes, but they aren't always enough because they're just squeezed in as part of the academic grind.

Enrollment will drop at the colleges that cut sports. True, a college is a place where a person goes to get academic training to pursue a chosen career, but the majority of students at the four-year educational institutions are straight out of high school, and they would like to get educated where they have easy access to athletics.

There are also the students who would still like to participate in sports, even if they are not planning to make a career out of it.

Maybe inter-collegiate sports aren't paying off as much as they should, or need to, but does that mean that all of them

should be axed? How about cutting those that are bringing in less money, along with some of the academic courses that aren't bringing in quite as much money as they should?

Perhaps the University of Oregon had the right idea just

cutting baseball rather than all sports. If that isn't feasible, maybe the four state-funded colleges should follow in the footsteps of the Portland high schools, and combine the institutions to come up with two or three whole colleges rather than four half colleges.



feedback

I.R.A. supporters view approbrium

To The Editor:

After reading the editorial, "Ireland: Nation of Rebels" by J. Dana Haynes in the May 20, 1981 issue of "The Print," I was not only slightly enraged at his ignorance, but also at his insensitivity to the Irish problem.

Yes, Bobby Sands is dead, and other hunger strikers have joined him, but they are not fools. Unless it is foolish to die for a reason, a cause, for the good of the people as a whole. Sands is gone now, his death was a slow, ugly process, but it did more for the cause of the IRA than Sands believed he could if he lived.

By starving himself, Sands put not only his name, but also that of the IRA in newspapers throughout the world. He won attention and support from people who were otherwise unaware of the Irish cause. He knew it was very doubtful his prison demands would ever be met, but he did know that through death springs life; and from the graves of patriot men and women spring living nations. His death, and that of the others, made outsiders face the problem.

No, Dana, the problem is not a complex problem, and it can be answered and pinpointed in no time at all. The Irish people are rooted in a past that includes colonial exploitation, revolt, famine, the splitting apart of families as migration to America became institutionalized. The Irish were and still are subjugated people who were constantly reminded that they were considered brutally inferior, racially degenerate, and

religiously misled. When England took control of Ireland 800 years ago (not 100 as your article states) it was against the will of all the Irish people. England considered it a "marriage" of the two nations. It turned out to be one of the most brutal rapes in world history.

To most Americans, Ireland of a hundred years ago conjures up little sod or rock huts, a pig or a goat in the field, a potato field, and a happy, jolly little peasant man enjoying his ale. That was far from the truth, because in 1840 the poverty and misery of the Irish appalled the traveler. The Frenchman deBeaumont found Ireland to be the extreme of human misery, worse than the Negro in his chains; the German Kohl wrote that no mode of life in all of Europe could seem pitiable after one saw Ireland.

All of this misery could almost without exception be traced to a single source—the system under which the land had come to be occupied and owned in Ireland, a system produced by centuries of successive conquests, confiscations and punitive legislation. England's attitude was summed up by Macaulay as he addressed the House of Commons in 1844, "How do you govern Ireland? Not by love but by fear...not by the confidence of the people in the laws and their attachment to the constitution but by means of armed men and entrenched camps.

Maybe my Irish blood runs thicker than yours, Mr. Haynes. Maybe the fierce loyalty to my ancestors

homeland is stronger. Maybe I, too, love a martyr (which brings me to add, Joan of Arc was also a victim of the English's fear!), but I know that grave injustices have been done. I'm realistic enough to know that as long as the British try to rule any of Ireland, the IRA will survive, because Ireland unfree shall never be at peace.

Susy Ryan

To The Editor:

I often wondered why Americans are hated around the world. At first, I assumed the hatred stemmed from jealousy, but after reading the article by Mr. Haynes on the Irish problem, the realization of sheer American stupidity comes leaping off "The Print."

To be ignorant of world affairs is quickly becoming an American past-time and Mr. Haynes may be the leading scholar. Ireland is two separate countries, and Northern Ireland is the center of the "troubles." To call Bobby Sands and other IRA prisoners fools is obviously the mark of an uninformed, simplistic clown. The British government has decimated, destroyed and practiced controlled genocide for over 300 years on the Irish people.

The Irish are the English niggers. No other word can describe their place in English history. But the Irish are acting ridiculous. Terrorism is quite un-cricket, by-jove. It appears those Irish croppies have learned how to humble those stiff-upper-lip limeys, right Mr. Haynes?

If you care to know, read "Barricades in Belfast," by a noted English writer Max Hastings. It was in 1968 when the Ulsterman attacked the Derry Bogside and the Falls. The IRA didn't even exist at the time. Finally, Irishman refused to lay down and now are fighting the only way to guarantee freedom.

This Irish problem is political. The Irish are demanding civil liberties and freedom. To fight for freedom is quite foolish. And slavery is not worth dying for. Then again we always knew about the drunken Irish Sods. John Bull will pay for his mistake and Ireland will be free. The Irish people are proven survivors and they possess an unconquerable spirit to persist all indignities. "Fools," hardly, we defend banana republics in South America, chase those communists in rice paddies but as a proclaimed defender of freedom, the United States remains stoically silent about the interned Irishmen. Then again, look at our cities, Detroit, Watts or the South Bronx. The English niggers live in Derry and Belfast. Maybe you're right Mr. Haynes, those Irish people are fools, but at least they're not cowards.

Tommy Silence

To The Editor:

The article, "Ireland, Rebels Without a Cause" (May 20 issue of "The Print"), has aroused my intelligence. I don't support terrorism nor do I believe there is such a thing as a good war or a bad peace. But

Mr. Haynes' simplistic approach to the Irish problem is irresponsible journalism. Northern Ireland, not the Republic of Ireland, is engulfed in civil strife. To attempt to delineate the "troubles" would take revealing 400 years of past history. But to label Bobby Sands and fellow comrades as fools is disturbing. It clearly shows an uninformed, insensitive outlook by Mr. Haynes.

One fact remains above all: Ireland has been cruelly and stupidly administered, her people shamefully persecuted, with every sort of indignity brought to bear. The Irish have been denied every human and material right. The great famine which deposited those seven million Irish-Americans on our shores was little more than a subtle exercise in "gentleman's genocide." The past is dead, what of Northern Ireland? It is the only British province where the Special Powers act and internment is actively used. These infamous special acts allow the counts to arrest, intern and hold any one suspicious of undermining the British Empire.

To die for civil rights—the right to vote, to equal housing and jobs—is surely a foolish thing to starve over, isn't it, Mr. Haynes? It's a pity we Americans are complacent about freedom, then again, what's so bad about slavery and injustice? The Irish should be happy, stripped of their language, culture and land—at least they can always celebrate St. Patrick's Day, right, Mr. Haynes?

Ed Coyne

Wednesday, May 27, 1981

Page 3