

Colleges wary of Court ruling

Where does it stop? Is this another snow ball effect? Can the Supreme Court decide on the freedom of the college press? The answer is "no," of course not!

The recent Supreme Court ruling determined that high school students do not have the same first amendment rights as adults. But who decides whether somebody is an adult or not? These are all very ethical questions, and they are hard to answer.

The thing which is really scary is, this Court decision can affect college students. And aren't we adult enough to decide what we want to say or write? We're all students above 18 and we basically have formed our own opinions and beliefs.

It would be totally ridiculous if we could not express our opinions anymore in, for example, student government, sports or student publications. All those activities are financed by the college, so could be censored if the Supreme Court decision is applied to community colleges.

It's understandable that high school students need guidance, since the high school population is as low as 14, and not everybody at age 14 has their mind made up.

But this is college, and we should not be affected by this decision in any way. The Supreme Court ruling was bad enough at the high school level. And even then, the problem in Hazelwood, Missouri could have been solved by the Editor or Advisor of the student newspaper, without the Principal interfering.

We, as college students, should express our concern and stand up for our constitutional freedoms. We are adult enough to understand the consequences of our behavior and speech, and do not need to be censored.

Remember, the Supreme Court ruling can be a snow ball effect and strike us. We simply cannot let that happen!

-CHAV-

Cutbacks threaten homeless

Tonight, when most American families are sitting together at their dinner tables eating warm meals in their comfortable heated homes, thousands of families all over this country will be alone in their cars eating whatever a restaurant has discarded. If they are lucky they will be able to stay in a shelter in warm beds and eat a warm meal in the company of alcoholics, drug addicts, and mentally ill people.

Homeless families are becoming a more common sight because of the high unemployment in this country and also because of the large cut backs which Ronald Reagan has encouraged in programs such as Welfare and Aid to Families with Dependent Children.

This cannot continue going on. Children cannot be going to school hungry and getting teased by their classmates because of their poor economic conditions, then coming home and not having a safe place to play because this country's cities have such high crime rates.

The government needs to provide programs for employment, medical care, and housing for this new breed in America.

Cities need to renovate old vacant buildings for these people to live in. They could even hire the parents to do the work, then move into the houses when they are finished.

The government also needs to provide programs through the school that provide safe places for the children to play after school and bring up their morale.

Our country is such a rich country with so much money, why do we allow families to live on the streets in poverty? Mainly because we would like to ignore the problem and hope that it just goes away. Well, it will not and we need to start helping these families before it's too late.

-MKT-

Letter to the editor

Irate reader responds to Iran editorial

The headline was spectacular! Your January 20 editorial jumped off the page right at me: "U.S. Condone Mass Slaughter of Kids in Iran."

Since we both know it is not the policy of the United States to condone the murder of children, I could only assume that the U.S. had supported some kind of large scale killing of baby goats. However, as I read your editorial I came to realize that you were, in fact, referring to children and I was appalled at the enormity of your ignorance.

Let me site some specific examples of your lack of comprehension concerning world affairs.

In your editorial you wrote, "How can the United States put up with such a person as the

Ayatollah Khomeini?" What do you mean by "...put up with..?" What do you propose we do? Wage total war with Iran? Or, maybe have the old boy assassinated?

We have broken diplomatic ties with Iran and asked our allies to boycott Iran. We have a strong military presence in the middle East, including a large naval task force in the Persian Gulf. Just what exactly do you suggest?

You also made the statement, "After all, we do sell weapons to them..." I should point out that the word "do" is present tense, which implies we are currently selling weapons to Iran. The United States is NOT currently selling arms to Iran, in fact it is a federal offense to sell arms to Iran.

It is true that a small number of government officials did recently sell a limited number of weapons to Iran in an effort to free American hostages. But, it should be noted that these people acted without congressional approval and without first advising other branches of Government or the American people. Which is why there have been hearings and so much uproar over the whole matter. It is not now - nor has it been, since the Ayatollah took power, the policy of the United States to sell arms to Iran. So, for you to write "...we do sell weapons to them..." is to make a very misleading statement.

In future editorials you can better serve your readers by staying away from tabloid sensationalism. If you are going to criticize, you might support your remarks by offering some possible solutions. And most important of all, do your homework so you know what the heck you're writing about!

In conclusion I noticed you failed to sign your name to your editorial. As if embarrassed by your own ignorance you only attached your initials to the piece, so readers could only guess at who wrote such dribble.

Since this is the style of the "Print's" editorial page I suppose it's expected of me to do the same.

-JRA-

Vote "YES" on levy

With the question out as to why Clackamas Community College is asking for a new tax levy, many of you may be confused on what your vote will be when March 22 rolls around.

Clackamas Community College is proposing a new levy after the first one failed earlier this school year. The new levy is five cents lower than the first proposal and seven cents higher than the current operating levy from 1981.

Whenever money enters into an issue, the first reaction from the public is "NO." And who can really blame them? With the current cost-of-living index up nearly 17 percent, the stock market crash earlier this school year, and the American dollar failing to hold its own against the yen, no one wants to spend any more than they have to.

It seems, though, that the public may be forgetting something amidst all this talk about money—education. Without education it is often difficult to live day-to-day, let alone find a decent job, and that is what Clackamas Community College is here for.

Clackamas Community College educates more than 20,000 community residents each year and last year it brought nearly \$7 million in outside revenue to Clackamas County, provided special employee training to the work force of the county's major employers, provided start-up and management assistance to nearly 700 current and prospective small business owners, and generated total expenditures of \$15.3 million in the local community from students, staff, and college business (non-payroll).

Obviously the college is very much a needed part of the community and should it be unable to continue to offer some of its programs, the community may suffer as much as the college itself. The increase is not outrageous when the advantages to keeping the college running are considered.

If you have not yet registered to vote, do so now and if you are already registered remember to vote "YES" when you receive your ballot the first week of March. Remember it's your education and your future—give Clackamas Community College a chance to be a part of it.

-SLV-

Editor's note

In response to JRA's letter, the reason why the editorials in "The Print" are not labeled is because that is our policy. On the editorials we take a stand as a staff, and we only label the writer by his/her initials. However, writers who submit a letter to the editor should sign it with their name, not only their initials. This time we decided to print the letter, but this is the only and last time. Any submitted letter should be signed; if not it will not be printed. Also the information in MLW's editorial was based on an editorial in "The Oregonian" which ran Jan. 18, 1988.

Should student newspapers be censored by school administrations?



"I don't believe that censorship of school newspapers is right. That violates your Constitutional Rights to freedom of the press, regardless of monies that are donated to the paper thru the school." —Steve Flemming—



"Yes, because the school's name is on it and therefore, they're somewhat responsible for what is in it." —Tory Bland (L), Kevin Shipman (R).—



"I don't think it's a good idea because we have rights to say what we want without fear of punishment, and the Supreme Court decision violates that right." —Jennifer Keller—

photos by Julie Church

