

Policy dictated

The clash between student newspapers and college administrations over who controls the publications has surfaced most recently in Portland. The editor and the managing editor of Portland State University's student newspaper, the *Vanguard*, are threatened with dismissal because of their refusal to run CIA ads. The Publications Board, which oversees the operation of the *Vanguard* and is seeking to dictate its editorial and advertising policy, has agreed to hear a complaint calling for the firing of the two editors.

The editor, Kathleen Hawkins, contends that the issue is who determines which ads are accepted, the *Vanguard* or the board. Court precedents on student newspapers' rights to accept or refuse ads are divided. One principle does stand out, however, that "grossly offensive or misleading" ads can be refused.

Board chairer David Smeltzer, PSU political science professor, recognizes that the paper has some constitutional guarantees on editorial content but refuses to extend this recognition to advertising policy. What he fails to comprehend is that advertising policy decisions are as much a part of the editorial freedom of a paper as the editorial statements on the editorial page. True, newspapers cannot engage in restraint of trade by capriciously refusing to run ads, but they also have a public duty to screen out ads that are fraudulent or excessively offensive.

Just as frightening as the board's intrusion into the *Vanguard's* editorial freedom is Smeltzer's contention that student newspapers supported by public institutions are an "arm of the state." The idea that the state through the use of administrative boards can define the editorial policy of a student newspaper destroys one of the main political premises of our society; that the press should be free of direct government control.

The rationale for the independence of student publications is best stated by Hawkins herself. "The paper is financed by student incidental fees which are allocated by a student committee. The paper is published for students by students."

The dangerous notion that the state can control the editorial policy of a newspaper must be dispelled. Regardless of the student nature of its operation and the fact that it receives some public support, the *Vanguard* strives to function as a legitimate newspaper and deserves the same protection and freedom as any other commercial newspaper. While the *Emerald* publishes CIA ads, we defend the *Vanguard's* right to exercise its own editorial policy independent of administrative interference. The *Emerald* vigorously opposes this attempt to manipulate the editorial policy of the *Vanguard* and urges that the board allow the *Vanguard's* editors to determine their own advertising policy.

Letters

Who's a thief?

Not too long ago, I read in the *Emerald* an article relating the unfortunate loss of some flags hung around the campus commemorating the University's first one hundred years. This is certainly no joke. But this is not what I am not laughing at. I mean after all, boys will be boys. This is not to say the culprits should not be administered the appropriate punishment after being found guilty of their heinous deed.

But I want to single out an understated but significant fact in the article; specifically the \$15 paid to the physical plant to hang each banner. Should not this gain the by-line? Does not this amount constitute a theft? How long does it take two men to hang a flag from a pole? Fifteen dollars to hang a flag from a pole? Why, I know several Condon second-graders who, for less than that amount, would gladly walk around campus with the flags held up in their arms for the next six months.

Gene Zaharie
English

The other side

To Ms. Neuenburg and the 24 co-signers:

As editor of *Surface and Symbol*, I have almost total control over what does or does not go into the arts and entertainment section. The first time I laid eyes on your letter was this morning, in the *Emerald*.

I would like to thank you for the letter and give you my reply, which is not in agreement with the editor-

ial page editor's. I am only sorry that I did not see the letter yesterday so I could give you my reply in addition to his, which was researched and is logical, but still, in my opinion, not a good one.

Maybe the typical student is 18-25, white and male, but, as I'm sure you are aware, the point is that we must break down the old stereotypes. Because we have been pushed so far one way for so long, we must now go a little farther in the opposite direction until everyone realizes what kind of values this form of stereotyping has created.

My editor's note: You're right, you have a good point and the drawing has been discontinued. The "Typical Oregon Student" articles are written by a male, but I am convinced that he is writing to and for an audience consisting of all students.

Again, thank you for calling my attention to my error. It saddens me sometimes when I realize how deeply the sexist conditioning goes in our society and that, try as I might to overcome it, I still often find myself a product of it.

Jenifer Blumberg
Oregon Daily Emerald staff

Oust Harter

After Washington's convincing win over the Ducks it is time to get rid of Coach Harter.

The famed Kamikaze Defense which Dick Harter instituted at the UO should be changed to read "Foul Defense." Although Washington "only" won by seven points, it was through no fault of the Ducks. The Ducks sent

Duck Soup

Oregon Daily Emerald



"Just a bowl of salad dressing...He refuses to eat the lettuce!"

Washington to the foul line 33 times and the margin of victory would have been much greater if the Huskies could have converted more than their 19 free throws.

Personally, I am tired of Oregon's third and fourth place finishes in the Pac-8. Maybe in past years UCLA was a good excuse not to win the Pac-8, but this year looks like an exception. In looking for reasons why Oregon can't win, I have come across various answers.

Initially, Oregon didn't win because Harter was a new coach and needed time to build a program. I submit that five years is enough time.

Next I heard that we didn't have caliber players. If Ron Lee, a college All-American and Stu Jack-

son and Ernie Kent, both high school All-Americans, are not caliber players, then I ask who is?

Then we lost because we have no big men. If other schools in the Pac-8 can attract the big men, why can't Oregon? I think Oregon has just as much to offer as UCLA, Washington and OSU, but then again, maybe we don't. Maybe many quality players are turned away by the overly aggressive defense we pursue.

Finally, Oregon loses because the referees are unfair in calling our games. This final argument could be true. Maybe the referees feel they are calling a football game instead of a basketball game when they ref our games. The popular image Kamikaze Defense brings to mind might pre-

judice any fair-minded official against us.

Whatever the other problems are that have to be resolved for Oregon to win, the first and most obvious is to can Harter and his Kamikaze Defense.

Jim Lewis
History, Sr.

Letters policy

The *Emerald* will accept and try to print all letters containing fair comment on ideas and topics of concern or interest to the University community. Because of space limitations, letters must be no more than 200 words, typed triple-spaced, dated and signed with the person's major.

opinion

Waist-high war

Once again the US government is up to its waist in a war in someone else's country. Once again the newspapers are full of talk about the "national interest," references to "aid and advisors" and "official denials." Once again it has become necessary for the American people to oppose the ruling class' military adventures.

This time it is Angola, on the west coast of southern Africa, that the American capitalists hope to keep under their control. For years, the US government aided Portugal to maintain its colonial rule in Angola and the US businesses profited. For example, US oil companies like Gulf Oil still control Angolan oil fields in Cabinda. Now, they have helped stir up a civil war there between organizations which all had fought to free Angola from Portuguese colonialism.

The US government admits having sent \$25,000,000 in cash and arms in the last three months alone to the groups it backs, UNITA and the FNLA. There is another \$25,000,000 on its way right now, plus more "advisors." The US also has a friend—the racist settler regime in South Africa—which has invaded Angola and has taken part in the fighting there.

The US capitalist class has a rival in its attempts to deny the Angolan people independence and control the country. This rival is the Soviet Union, which because it is now capitalist and not socialist, has become the US's chief competitor in international robbery. Only after the Portuguese were beaten and had made arrangements to grant independence to a coalition government made up of all three groups, did the superpowers jump in with large-scale "aid" to play on differences between the groups.

The Soviets have been pouring "aid" to one organization, the MPLA. They have been pouring guns, tanks, rockets, even MIG jets into the Ango-

lan capital, Luanda, which is held by the MPLA. During the long war against Portugal, they had never provided the liberation forces with such weapons. They have also brought in 5000 troops from Cuba, whose economy is permanently mortgaged to the capitalists of the USSR and whose leader, Fidel Castro, has pledged "Cubans will never be disloyal or ungrateful" to Brezhnev and company.

The US and USSR each point to the involvement of the other side and its sidekicks in the fighting to justify their own role. What both are after, however, is control over the tremendous wealth of Angola and its strategic location. Angola has oil, gold, diamonds, iron and other minerals in abundance and soil and climate so favorable for agriculture it is already the world's third biggest coffee producer. Its location is important both for naval ports in the south Atlantic and for influencing all of southern Africa.

As the war in Angola continues, so does the extent of US involvement. There is a lot of debate within the American ruling class over how best to proceed, but one thing is clear. They are ready to sacrifice the lives of tens of thousands of Angolans to advance their interests, and depending on developments, may even send in American forces to strengthen their bid.

The only solution to the current conflict in Angola is for both of the superpowers, and the other countries they are working through, to get the hell out and let the Angolan people settle their differences. More and more the feeling of the American people is that our interests lie in keeping the US ruling class from carving up another country.

Revolutionary Student Brigade
John Lanier
Bert Knorr