

Waking up from the nightmare of Nick Barron

This letter is in response to the article, "Waking up from the nightmare of the NBA" by Nick Barron that appeared in the April 17th edition of *The Clackamas Print*. Nick had two opinions within his article, the first one being that the NBA finals are lackadaisical and sleep-inducing. The other was that Nick likes baseball more than basketball. He said nothing to support his opinions, yet still managed to consume half a page with mindless babble.

When the article was printed this year's playoffs had not started, so Nick must have been upset, most recently, with last year's playoffs. I admit the Western Conference games left much to be desired, unless you're a Laker fan. The Eastern Conference, however, had many games that were close and exciting. Most of the series were played out all five or seven games. One had no idea which team was going to come out as champion until Game 7 of the Conference Finals. This streak even carried into the finals when, in Game 1, Philadelphia became the only team to give the Lakers a loss in last year's playoffs. How is this lackadaisical or sleep-inducing?

In paragraph five of Nick's article, he implies that baseball is superior to basketball. He supplies no evidence to support this comment, but he makes many statements in attempt to belittle basketball.

Let's apply Nick's statements about basketball to baseball to see if baseball is, in fact, superior. Nick wrote about NBA players swinging punches and throwing basketballs into the stands. How often does a batter charge the mound? How many times have managers and referees kicked dirt on each other, yelling so violently that they are red-faced, spit flying from their mouths? How many times, through the years, have we seen whole teams empty their dugouts, making the baseball diamond look like a battlefield that rivals any "BraveHeart" scene? How is baseball better?

Nick also stated that professional wrestling is a healthy format for the public to see people with grudges work out their differences. For once, Nick and I share an opinion. A few years ago Karl Malone and Denis Rodman got into the "squared-circle" and battled out an entire season worth of potential court brawls. Have two baseball players ever done this?

Many people share the feeling that sports figures should elevate themselves and be examples of ideal citizenship. Millions of fans think that athletes should be people that children can look up to and hope to someday emulate. Nick targeted Allen Iverson as basketball's greatest evil-doer. I have two words for you, Nick: John Rocker.

The point that I hope to get across, is that if Nick wants to write about his opinion, he needs to in-

clude facts that support it. A sports column should not be something thrown together in ten minutes. Reading Nick's article was a waste of my time, and he wasted space in an otherwise good newspaper.

Edward S. Phillips
Student

"Gifts" not always legit

The headlining article for today's *Clackamas Community College* newspaper disclosed the web site addresses, fundraiser events, and most recent discovery of human remains into the disappearance of Ashley Pond and Miranda Gaddis. About half of the story suggested that people who claim they have a "gift" may be able to provide assistance in the case. The journalist of the article, Salena De La Cruz, chose to include an extremely detailed profile of the alleged abductor submitted to this forum by an anonymous individual who claims to have "premonitions or visions of an event." Although Cruz noted that it was not illegal to print a sketch of the suspected monster (according to the Student Press Law Center, N.Y.) what was she thinking?! Did it ever occur to Cruz that the person who submitted this profile and sketch could be the same individual who abducted Miranda and Ashley? Or better yet, and maybe less likely, it could be the sophomoric plot of a jealous lover seeking revenge on her former significant other.

If this phantom source that produced the suspect's fantasy profile is a true clairvoyant then why didn't the profile include information that could actually be used in the case? For example, a home address would be a decent lead in the investigation. If the only key-witness to this crime exists in another reality (not ours), then why is it necessary to print this in a newspaper? I agree there are people in this world who have a convincing track record of real predictions, etc. Unfortunately, these are the same people who suffer from the backlash of unsupported claims made by quacks and charlatans whose only reputations are a myriad of deception.

In other words, if you're going to write about a phenomenon, give it some reference to an empirical source — not an anonymous subscriber of an Internet forum.

Marc Cramer
Instructor

The Print does not meet mission statement

Dear *Clackamas Print*:

Thank you for considering the opinion of your readers. I am happy you value the freedom of expression in your paper. However, the freedom you claim has been abused in the April 24th, 2002, article "Famous porn star salutes Oregon."

A famous quotation by Eric Hoffer reminds us, "The basic test of freedom is perhaps less in what we are free to do than what we are free not

to do." I rejoice to say that we have the freedom of speech in the United States; however, I shudder when the press prints biased information to the student body and promotes pornography to students, including minors. Currently, there are hundreds of 13-14-15-16 and 17 year olds enrolled at *Clackamas Community College*. The "Porn Star" article is advertising pornography to these minors. The majority of students on this campus agree, even the most liberal of us, that advertising pornography to minors is unethical. Additionally, the "Porn Star" article is extremely biased because there is no mention of the opposing viewpoint. Arguments against pornography like, broken relationships and the dehumanizing of the individual, were completely ignored. The article used language like "hero" (line four) to describe the porn star, Ron Jeremy, and referred to porn shows as "harmless fun" (last column mid-section). In a biased manner, this use of language gives a one-sided, positive outlook on pornography to the students on this campus, especially influencing the developing minds of the 13-14 and 15-year-olds. While the article contained a warning at the beginning, students should be free to read their school paper without having to flip through an advertisement for pornography. Additionally, the warning implied in a degrading manner that anyone who disagrees with the article does not appreciate the freedom of expression. The *Clackamas Print* is designed to serve the students first, not tell us that if we disagree with their articles that we are un-American!

Finally, the *Print's* article did not meet the goals nor the mission statement of the *Clackamas Print*. The *Print's* goal of unbiased information, failed. Additionally, the mission of giving vital information about the college failed because the "Porn star" article was an advertisement for the porn star and not a balanced, informative editorial. I regret that *The Clackamas Print's* standard of excellence has sunk so low. Please, officially apologize for giving us, your readers, biased information and apologize for advertising pornography to my friends and fellow students. Take a step toward editorial excellence by featuring a balanced article in the next edition of the *Print*, which deals with both views of pornography laws and use in Oregon and how it relates to the students of *Clackamas Community College*. And/or, please give *The Print's* response to the main arguments of my letter. If nothing else, keep the *Porn Star* in *Playgirl* or *Playboy*, not in *The Clackamas Print*. I look forward to reading your next issue.

Paul Southwick
Student

Freedom of speech not for everything

Dear *Clackamas Print*:

No more than a half a year ago America stood by in horror as a good 5,000 people mindlessly were murdered in New York and Washington D.C.

We were united, we waved flags,

both Republicans and Democrats alike sang "God Bless America" on national television, we had candle light vigils. We hugged, we cried but most of all it seemed we turned. Even now, we see the bumper stickers "God Bless America." It cannot be hidden what this country was based on and the morals our forefathers stood for. Yet here we are six months later, once again perverse, a shame to human decency, we make a mockery of ourselves before the world. I read your article on "Famous porn star salutes Oregon," and the warning at the beginning, which hid behind freedom of expression. Is this what our forefathers meant when they wrote of "freedom of speech," is this what you as a college, designed to serve the community, teach? It seems to me as if it is time for this country to get its mind out of the gutter, and if this article is a depiction of how your institute intends to teach American citizens, many of whom may be no more than 16 years old, how to better themselves, I don't believe I need say more. I do not see how an article as offensive as this can possibly be what you want known of your colleges standards. I ask you to start teaching a level of decency. If that means starting with your "freedom of expression," than please present yourselves in at least a respectable manner. As far as your mission statement, how does this serve students first? How does a porn star serve or better the surrounding community, have you any idea what this stuff can do to homes, is this vital information? And where is the college even mentioned, you say *The Print* "balances opinion," in order to balance an opinion both sides must be heard, here is another side. LET IT BE HEARD.

Robert Larson
Student

Content not age appropriate

Dear *Clackamas Print*,

A friend of mine brought my attention to an article in your newspaper titled "Famous porn star salutes Oregon." It is my opinion that this article has no place in a college campus, where it can be read by all, young and old. The writers and editors at your newspaper need to remember the age of their audience. Many of them are high school students. For this reason, it is irresponsible of your paper to print this type of article.

Students at *Clackamas Community College* have no need for this type of information. They come here to learn valuable skills that they will need in the workplace, not bawdy humor. There is a plentiful supply of useful news for your paper to cover. Please refrain from printing articles that contain crass content in the future.

Darian Pike
Student

Porn is not right

Dear *Clackamas Community College*:

I was quite disturbed when I read the "Porn Star" article in April twenty-fourth's issue in *The Clackamas Print*. There are such flaws with it that I have to wonder why you chose to print it.

First, your paper's mission statement holds that its purpose is to serve the college student body. May I humbly remind you that there is a good portion of the student body younger than age 18. Did you further know that it is a crime to sell or advertise porn to minors? A law I know was established for the purpose of protecting young and developing minds.

The second problem I have with this article is its style. A newspaper, by its very nature, is for the purpose of reporting news. This article fully fits in the category of "infomercial."

Lastly, you routinely tout freedom of speech in the "Porn" article. I have heard it said, "Freedom is not the right to do as one pleases, but the freedom to do what is right." I would submit to you that porn, in general, is not right because it destroys relationships, marriages, and cheapens and dishonors people, women especially, by focusing only on their outward physical appearance and not on their internal qualities.

I would encourage you to apologize for presenting an article that was not only biased, but also not representative of the common needs and interests of the whole college body. News relevant to the school would be things such as sports, students or building projects. I submit this with utmost respect and dismay.

Matt Rouse
Student

More journalism classes, please

I find Allison Gerfin's article in *The Clackamas Print* extremely poor journalism. One expects to find articles that may be of no interest, articles that one disagrees with, but not to find such blatant biased information. One really expects more from a college newspaper whose mission statement reads, "Serves the college students first, and provides vital information about the college." Whose goals read; "report the news in an unbiased professional manner."

The warning itself reads as biased and unprofessional. It insinuates that people who disagree with an article about pornography, "don't appreciate freedom of expression." This is sloppy sentimentality.

Colleges are meant to be institutions of higher learning. Perhaps a few more classes in journalism would help.

Mata Kimmel
Student