

Monologue & Dialogue

Idle Hands

By J. Dana Haynes

Okay, the elections are over, and truth to tell there were no great surprises this year. Most of the races ended up pretty much the way the polls predicted, with one notable exception.

Governor Vic Atiyeh was reelected in a landslide over challenger Ted Kulongoski. Before last Friday, it looked like the two combatants were tied neck-and-neck, and up until Tuesday, it was a horse race.

And yet, come 10:00 p.m. Wednesday, Atiyeh was so comfortably entrenched in the lead that both he and Kulongoski made their acceptance and concession speeches, respectively.

It came as a surprise to most everybody. This is, after all, an off-year (non-presidential) election. In the past, the party in power, in this case the Republicans, have usually lost ground to the opposition party, in this case the Democrats. Thus it is that a great many analysts were predicting Democrat Kulongoski to pull ahead and squeeze through for a victory. Or at the very least, for Atiyeh to ride the coat tails of Reagan's "Stay The Course" advertisements and sneak by for reelection.

So what happened? In the past week, I've heard two radio newsmen and one television anchorman imply that the outcome bodes ill toward the future of the Democratic party in Oregon. That perhaps the GOP is here to stay.

Nonsense. Slick Vic's re-coronation had nothing to do with any popular mandates nor course-staying, as the President's Wall Street advertising agencies would have us believe.

The plain truth is that Kulongoski ran a crummy campaign. From the very beginning, the two politicians and their campaign point-men opted for a policy of mud slinging, the likes of which I don't remember ever seeing before.

However, the people of Oregon (take a bow, all) are a tad more politically savvy than the rest of the country and it didn't take the voters long to get tired of the mutual hate society.

Now Atiyeh may be a wee bit more dull than a spam-on-white-bread-sandwich, but he's no one's fool. He and his people heard the rumblings of discontent and backed off the negative rhetoric.

Meanwhile, Kulongoski kept right on slinging spitballs. For nearly two months, the airwaves were saturated with Ted's perfectly coiffed good looks, calm demeanor, and every byte of muck he could draw fourth. True or false isn't the point. Kulongoski did everything except accuse Atiyeh of being a gay Nazi bubble-dancer.

This was the first election I can remember wherein I voted against one fellow, rather than for the other guy. Atiyeh never impressed me one way or t'other, but at least, in this race, I knew where he stood. With Kulongoski, all I knew about him was where he didn't stand. And that's not enough to give the man the reigns for four years.

So the moral of the story is that Victor Atiyeh is in office. No mandates were given, no death knell was trumped for the Demo's.

Their candidate simply didn't give us any good reason to vote for him.

THE PRINT, a member of the Oregon Newspaper Publishers Association, aims to be a fair and impartial journalistic medium covering the campus community as thoroughly as possible. Opinions expressed in THE PRINT do not necessarily reflect those of the College administration, faculty, Associated Student Government or other members of THE PRINT.

Office: Trailer B; telephone: 657-8400, ext. 309,310

Editor in Chief: J. Dana Haynes

News Editor: Doug Vaughan

Arts Editor: Brett Bigham

Sports Editor: Tracy M. Sumner

Photo Editor: Wanda Percival

Copy Editor: Kristi Blackman

Staff Writers: Victoria Archila, Shelley Ball, Kari Gassaway, Doris Hatcher, Tom Jeffries, Etta Leonard, Walt McAllister, F. T. Morris

Staff Photographers: Roberta Ellsworth, Duane Hiersche, Troy Maben, Joel Miller

Business Manager: Joan Seely

Typesetter: Teresa A. Hannaford

Advisor: Sara Wichman

Abortion editorial vehemently opposed

To the Editor:

I feel strongly compelled to reply to the amazingly fatuous editorial written by your sports editor, Mr. Sumner. First, I should like to concede that he is correct on one point--his commentary was not well received by all. I am one who objects. As a single woman with independence and a career in mind, I must support the choice of individual women to exercise control over their bodies and their lives. Women have never had this choice before. There are those of us who have no intention of losing that freedom now. Obviously, Mr. Sumner finds it easy to criticize something which he will never have to experience first-hand.

I wish to point out that the removal of public funding for therapeutic abortions will not stop abortion. It will only change the quality of abortions. If a woman wants an abortion, she will get one. And if her situation is desperate enough, she will submit to the horrors of a back alley butcher or try to self-abort with a coat hanger or some other equally loathsome method. Would this be better? Shall we add the lives of full-grown women to the list of "murdered infants?" Perhaps "suicide" is a better word than "abortion?"

Let's be brutally honest about another issue. There is no such thing as The Sanctity of Life. I found your referral to the Israeli army and the PLO ironically amusing in this context. It's completely moral to wipe out women, children, old men and grandmothers in the name of God, Country or some other patriotic B.S., but God forbid we should let a woman terminate an unwanted pregnancy. I ask you--what's the difference if a child dies in an abortion clinic or as gun-fodder for some vague political issue? How can one be more acceptable than the other?

I was also incensed at Mr. Sumner's creative writing concerning the "face of the victim." Obviously he has spent more time looking at *Right To Life* brochures than his biology books. Most therapeutic abortions take place before the twelfth week of pregnancy. At that stage, the human fetus is indistinguishable from any other mammalian fetus. To say the "the face of the victim is grossly twisted and contorted in agony over the fatal violations on its body by the implements of torture used to perform the abortion" is the most over-dramatic writing I have ever seen. There isn't much of what you could call a "face" at twelve weeks to twist and contort.

True, the unborn baby is helpless. But won't women be

the same if abortion rights are revoked? What about the woman whose birth control methods fail, as they can do? What about the woman who already has a family too large to adequately support? Or the woman who becomes pregnant at 40 or 50 years of age?

The statement that abortion is "an easy way out of the consequences of one's actions" is the most outrageous thing I have ever read. And to consider a decision for an abortion a "whim" is ridiculous. Abortion is never an easy decision for anyone. It is expensive, degrading, painful and physiologically upsetting, without even considering what "moral" issues the woman may be contemplating. It is often the emotional turning point in a male-female relationship, including those within the sanctity of marriage. Promiscuity has little to do with abortion. Women who are promiscuous are often adept at avoiding pregnancy. It is just as often young, sexually-ignorant girls and adult women who undergo the procedure. To name promiscuity as the major cause of abortion is unfounded.

Now I have a rhetorical question to ask Mr. Sumner: What do you propose we do with all these unwanted-but-nonetheless-delivered babies? Give them up for adoption? That's a nice, easy solution. But once again, let's be realistic. Black marketeering has made adoption a joke.

Vohs letter draws fire

To the Editor:

I am writing this letter in response to Steve Vohs reply to a letter written by Dale Seale.

Let me start out by saying that I have never advocated censorship of the press (except during wartime). I believe that everyone should be allowed to express their opinion (even though I might disagree with it).

My question to Mr. Vohs is, why is Dale's opinion considered advocacy of censorship? Today opinions are expressed by communists, nazis, homosexuals, murderers, drug abusers and racists. This is considered "free expression." Why is it that when someone who is a Christian expresses their opinion it is called "self righteous censorship?"

It seems to me that Dale was merely expressing his opinion that the movie in question ("Halloween") was nauseating. Having seen the movie I agree.

"Halloween" depicts people being brutally ripped, gauged, stabbed and killed in revolting detail. Why is it that

Why wait years to adopt a baby if you can buy one within days? And why give away an unwanted baby if you can make a little money for your time? The authorities can't stop people from selling their unwanted children now. Can you imagine what it would be like if every pregnant woman was forced to deliver her child?

And what about the woman who delivers the baby? "Tough luck, kid?" "That's what you get for being promiscuous?" "Hope you can pick up your career again?" "Try not to think about it?"

To say that abortion can be stopped is to say that the human race will someday be perfect. Unwanted pregnancies will occur. As long as there are people who prefer to be ignorant about their own sexuality, there will be a need for abortions. As long as science drags its feet at perfecting birth control methods, there will be a need for abortions. As long as there are people who try to hide the truth under a pile of "morals", there will be a need for abortions. And as long as there are deranged individuals who can get away with rape and incest, there will be a need for abortions.

I sincerely hope that Mr. Sumner also learns to see life as it is and not only as it should be if he hopes to be an effective journalist.

Yours truly,
Joette L. Rose

because Dale feels that showing such acts being inflicted on his fellow humans is poor entertainment (and daring to say so) that his opinion is called "self righteous censorship?"

It seems to me that the fact that such a large number of people enjoy seeing such nauseating behavior, is a strong condemnation on the human race.

Mr. Vohs seems to apply a double standard to opinions that disagree with his own. Mr. Vohs considers the movie entertaining (that's his right), but since Dale happens to disagree, Dale is guilty of being a "self righteous censor."

Mr. Vohs considers Dale as a self-appointed critic of the arts with self written credentials. Now what seems to make Mr. Vohs' credentials as a critic of the arts any more valid than Dale's (or anyone else's)?

Mr. Vohs should remember that those "certain self righteous factions" (his opinion of Christians) have the same right to express an opinion concerning the entertainment value of a film as he does.

Michael Houston

