

# Monologue

Poor Richard



by Byington



## Abortion shouldn't be illegalized

By Shelley Ball  
Of The Print

Few and far between. That phrase aptly describes the amount of letters to the editor that have been sent into *The Print* this school year. So, in an attempt to get more of you out there to write to us, I thought I would write about a topic that is practically guaranteed to do just that.

At least, this particular topic was responsible for having two consecutive issues of *The Print's* editorial pages filled with all sorts of emotional responses a few years back. Just what topic was powerful enough to generate such a massive response?

Abortion.

Now that the word's out, I'll set some guidelines for the letters: First and foremost, let's not get into a fight over whether it's right to be pro-choice or pro-life (whatever those terms mean). The arguments for each side haven't changed much, so there's no sense in sounding like a broken record.

What should be the concern of everyone is the possibility that, following a game of musical chairs in the United States Supreme Court, abortion could be made illegal.

While the chance of illegalizing abortion is unclear at the moment, the mere possibility of this happening should be enough to scare people. By making abortion illegal, people would be allowing the federal government to control the lives of women in deciding their fate concerning pregnancy.

I'm not saying abortion should be or is the best way to handle an unexpected pregnancy- but I'm saying abortion should never be eliminated as an option, no matter what the circumstances are concerning the pregnancy.

Whether anti-abortionists like it or not, for some women abortion may be for them the best choice to make for their individual situation. Granted, there are other ways of handling an unexpected pregnancy, and abortion is definitely not for every woman. Women who would not under any circumstances have an abortion

and instead handle the situation another way (adoption, for example) should be applauded for their courage, but women who do decide to have an abortion should be respected for their decision in the same manner.

Those who support the idea of illegalizing abortion should be ashamed of themselves. What makes them think they can impose their beliefs and feelings on others, that they can force people to do something simply because they disagree with their decisions?

It is every person's right to be allowed to make their own decisions, and to have a choice in making those decisions. Illegalizing abortion, however, is depriving women of their freedom to have a choice.

Being pro-choice doesn't have to mean one condones abortions for all unexpected pregnancies, but rather means supporting the right for abortion to remain a legal, safe option for women to have in deciding their fate.

People should stop arguing over whether it's right to be pro-life or pro-choice. Instead, they should consider whether they want the federal government telling them how to conduct their lives.

Orwell's "1984" may have passed, but illegalizing abortion would bring frightening reality to the phrase, "Big Brother is watching you."

## Community Corner

By Fritz Wenzel

If art can capture your attention through sheer beauty, intricate detail or striking color and make you hang around long enough to reap a meaning or a message, its purpose has been accomplished. If that message leads people to do great things that preserve a part of humanity, then art has been justified.

The mural at the bottom of the wheelchair ramp in Barlow Hall got my attention the other day, and its message bears passing along.

The mural, which is rich in color and contrast, stretches about 25 feet wide and is about 15 feet tall. It testifies to the ongoing struggle between the environment and the industrial progress of man.

The mural depicts two worlds; the industrial smokestacks, the bumper-to-bumper traffic that emanates from the modern city, and the steel structures that mark what we call progress and success on one side, and the free-flowing stream, the fruited orchard and the bright sky that we find in nature on the other side.

The conflict of the mural is dramatized in the grayish-white human figures that are battling in the central foreground. Here a few warriors with shields and clubs, apparently defenders of Man's progress, beat back masses of unarmed, unclothed men, women and children. It is a classic expression of the few with power forcing the many without power to succumb to the force of development.

The masses are responding to this brutality by retreating from the industrial side of the mural to the side where nature peacefully reigns. In their exodus, they are putting a high priority on getting the children off to a path where they can run to a bright horizon full of hope. In fact, only the small children are running down this path, which is protected by monk-like figures in full-

length robes. It is clear that the artist wants to convey the precious value of a child's life. They above all must be saved.

The environment and progress so often conflict with each other in today's world that it is easy to ignore the ongoing battle. The mural in Barlow pleads with us to not ignore the battle.

The battle is waged daily at the Hanford Nuclear Plant in Washington State. For instance: This past week the employees at the plant discovered that their drinking water is contaminated. The few with the power did not anticipate that this contamination would occur, but in fact they now admit that it has been contaminated for the last five years.

This past December workers at Hanford who construct nuclear warheads for the Defense Department were being exposed to excessive levels of radiation at the rate of more than one per work day. The few with the power did not anticipate that the exposures would occur, but they withheld safety information for nearly a month, until the government required them to report it.

The next two years the federal government will decide if this same Hanford site should be the storage place for all the nation's nuclear waste. The few with the power will promote the idea. What will the masses do? Will all those who live downstream of Hanford, including the students of this College willingly accept with apathy a possible cancer rate 10 times the national average as has been projected if the Columbia River is contaminated? Will deformed babies be the price the powerless will pay? The Barlow mural begs that these questions be asked.

If art can give us a message, it is successful. If that message leads people to do great things that preserve a part of humanity, then art has been justified.

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. THE PRINT is a weekly publication distributed each Wednesday except for finals week. Clackamas Community College, 19600 S. Molalla Avenue, Oregon City, Oregon 97045.

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

Editor In Chief: Shelley Ball

News Editor: Fritz Wenzel

Arts Editor: D. Dietrich

Sports Editor: Rodney Fobert

Copy Editor: Fritz Wenzel

Photo Editor: Joel Miller

Advertising Manager: Jack Griffith

Cartoonist: Richard Byington

Advertising Representative: Richard Byington

Staff Writers: Shelley Davis, J. Jason,

Amy LaBare, Julie Miller, Heather Wright

Staff Photographers: Rodney Fobert, Jeff Meek,

Mike Templeton, Daniel Wheeler

Typesetter: Diana Blakley

Advisor: Dana Spielmann

