

# No answer

State System Chancellor Roy Lieuallen's response last week to ASUO charges that the State Board of Higher Education (SBHE) had illegally spent \$430,000 of excess dormitory revenue was a flat denial. While the volume of the denial was sufficient, the response lacked substance. His response was that the action was not in violation of Oregon law or the board's policy. He failed, however, to specifically answer any of the ASUO's charges.

The ASUO contends that the SBHE's decision in 1970 to spend \$430,000 from dormitory reserve funds to construct covered tennis and handball courts south of 15th Avenue was in violation of state law ORS 351.160. This law prohibits the use of dormitory reserves to construct facilities of "dissimilar use and character."

Lieuallen counters that the expenditure was made with the full knowledge of Oregon State Emergency Board (OSEB). Minutes of the June 19, 1970, meeting of the OSEB, which approved the construction show, however, that only \$50,000 of the project was to be paid out of state funds and that the balance of \$580,000 was to come from bonds repaid by student fees.

Clearly the spirit, if not the letter, of Oregon law was disregarded when the SBHE spent the \$430,000 from dormitory reserve funds to build the tennis courts. If the courts had been constructed solely for the use of dormitory residents, there may have been some justification. The courts, however, are open to all University students and, according to the ASUO, they are used primarily for PE classes and other instructional purposes. In essence dormitory residents are underwriting the cost of a facility intended for campus-wide use. They paid for it and everybody else is using it.

The University's dormitory system was built with self-liquidating bonds and was intended to be self-sustaining. The reserves are designed to provide a two-year interest payment cushion and amounts over this limit can be used for expansion of services and operations. As a result of inflation, dormitory rates and other University services have increased sharply. Theoretically money from this reserve fund could have been used to take some of the bite out of this increase. At least it could have been used to improve the quality of food service operation or upgrade the rooms.

The point is that money generated by dormitory residents was not spent to their direct benefit. The SBHE inappropriately spent the money and these students and the dormitory system deserve some type of remuneration.

## Letters

### Poor definition

The *Emerald's* policy of censoring material only if it discriminates "...against any age, race, sex, color, national origin, religion or sexual orientation" is an excellent facade for the editors to do what they damn well please. The statement is sufficiently broad, and the term "discriminate" is so poorly defined, that it doesn't take much intelligence to justify censoring whatever is personally displeasing.

A much more rational policy is to print any ad that is not obviously slanderous or otherwise illegal. Although even this policy is subject to abuse, it is not nearly so easily manipulated to satisfy the personal desires of the editors, and is more in keeping with the liberal image which the paper tries to maintain. Perhaps the problem would be alleviated if the *Emerald* adopted a policy of not discriminating against the intelligence of its readers.

Jonathan Rode  
physics,  
graduate student

### Line dropped

In a January 28th letter to the *Emerald*, it accused someone else of stating pure drivel. Unfortunately, due to a line dropped in printing, part of my letter came out as drivel. I commented that the Bohemia lumber plant controversy is a result of the Oregon Supreme Court *Baker vs Milwaukie* decision rather than of Senate Bill 100 or LCDC actions. The next sentence should have read: "This decision was based on a law passed in 1919 that requires zoning to be based on a well-considered plan."

Undoubtedly it was my careless

use of "based on" twice in one sentence that tripped up the typesetter. However, the key to my argument was the fact that the supreme Court in its decision made use of a statute far predating SB100.

Dorothy Anderson  
LCDC Commissioner

### Issue taken

I would like to take issue with Mr. Byler's suggestion that anti-trust laws be used to limit labor's ability to shut down an area of the economy.

The approach has been tried in the past and soundly rejected. In 1890 Congress passed the Sherman Anti-Trust Act giving the courts the power to issue injunctions to stop conspiracies in the restraint of trade. Although originally intended for use against industrial giants, the statute in practice became a device for retarding unionization efforts. This perversion of the legislative intent was finally ended with the passage of the Norris-La Guardia Act in 1932 banning the use of anti-labor injunctions.

Mr. Byler's annoyance at experiencing difficulty in traveling is understandable. Nonetheless, it pales into insignificance when the importance of raises to striking workers is considered. And while the machinists are relatively well paid, it is important to remember that the anti-trust doctrine's application could not be limited to this sector of labor alone. Southern textile workers, who are notoriously ill paid, would suffer its effects along with the IAM.

When speaking of anti-trust statutes, it is useful to recall that the idea developed as a response to the threat of big industry. This threat still exists. The cost to the consumer of inefficient business arrangements is far greater



'THE CHURCH COMMITTEE CALLS FRANK SINATRA — ER, ON THE OTHER HAND, IF MISTER SINATRA WOULD RATHER NOT...'

though less visible than the cost of raises negotiated by organized labor.

Tom Page  
Law

### Location needed

This is in response to the article in Thursday's *Emerald* (1-29) concerning the Used Book Exchange. The Used Book Exchange is a service of Alpha Phi Omega Service Fraternity. This service was originated winter term of the 74-75 school year and was operated in the UO Bookstore basement. During winter term last year, we made a request to the bookstore to again allow us to operate our service in the basement during spring term. Our request was denied by the manager and the bookstore board without a chance for us to present our case. For that reason, we sat outside the bookstore in the snow and cold during spring term. We decided to try to operate in the EMU Lobby this term but have found this location unacceptable and will again try to persuade the bookstore to accept our request. For this service to become a viable alternative to buying new texts, we need to be consistent in location and need the support of the student population.

Paul L. Stephens  
VP for Service  
Zeta Psi Chapter  
Alpha Phi Omega  
National Service Fraternity

### Cattle civil

The excitement generated by this University's successful basketball program has engendered one serious problem. The situation outside Mac Court before pivotal contests is unconscionable. The competition among student spectators for prime seats is every bit as intense and physical as the competition on the playing floor.

There appear to be two prevailing philosophies on the acceptable method of attaining the seat of one's choice. One school of thought ascribes to the practice of arriving at the pavilion well in advance of game time, even to the point of camping before the doors on the night before the game. The other school possesses the immoral arrogance requisite to arrive 15 minutes before the doors open and hurl themselves upon the flank of the line from University Street, showing no consideration

for the safety and dignity of those students who have sacrificed their time (a student's most precious commodity) to hold a position near the front of the line. The inhuman effect of the shoving from the sides, and the relentless power of the surging crowd from behind creates a dangerously chaotic condition. I have seen cattle being loaded deport themselves with more civility. Many students suffer minor injuries in the crush, a serious injury is very probable. The ASUO is searching for methods to alleviate this bedlam.

The Incidental Fee Committee and the ASUO Athletic Commission are holding a hearing this afternoon (Monday February 2) at 1:30 p.m. in the EMU (room to be announced) in order to solicit student input. We hope to generate original insights into the problem and perhaps develop innovative solutions.

Jamie Burns  
Chairer IFC

### Logic circular

On January 27, a letter to the editor appeared in the *Emerald*. In response to the letter, allow me to deliver the following comments:

First, let us look at the circular logic of the writer. In expressing his astonishment at the "not guilty" plea of the demonstrators, he suggests that they "say yes we are guilty and we will take the consequences. But we would do it again—and take the consequences again." Furthermore, Jim Ralph says had that been their plea he would have been supportive, however, as of now he just joined a two-member coalition against the United Front Against Boyd.

In essence, what Jim Ralph is saying is that those students are really "guilty," because of the mere fact of demonstrating, which puts them in a position of "breaking the law" regardless of what ever was their motive. Now, if we are talking about the moral value of demonstrating versus other means of conveying a message, let us then look at what those students encountered in their endless attempts of using "proper channels." For the last three years that I've been here, students have organized and rallied against non-UFW lettuce being used on campus. Moreover, during 1975 a student poll was taken in which 75 per cent of the students voted against non-UFW lettuce on campus. The University's response was to ignore the vote and continue its lettuce policy. I wonder if Jim Ralph was then a student. If he was I would like to know what

his democratic and law-oriented conscience told him.

I am confused. Jim Ralph's conclusion is that the demonstrators are guilty only because they were arrested. To me, this contradicts two of his stated beliefs: First, he maintains that the University is not above criticism. However, instead of criticizing the University for its police tactics against those who stood up to criticize it, he is condemning those who initiated that criticism. Second, although Jim Ralph implies his support for the UFW, and states his conviction of the need for "responsible change," there is no single indication (in the context of his letter) of even advising the University to change its unjust policy against the farmworkers.

Finally, people should know that the farmworkers will need the support of everybody, in whatever way possible, to implement the California law which allows farmworkers to choose their own union.

Ibrahim Al-mansour  
Management

### Better use

It is unfortunate that some banners have been stolen. What is more unfortunate, however, is that they were purchased in the first place. When tuition hikes and program cuts are being proposed due to a lack of funds, it seems to me that a more effective use could be made of the limited resources available.

Carol Brown  
Accounting

### John-Boy knows

In reference to "Journalists wait at door" by Nick Gallo, *Emerald*, Thursday, Jan. 29.

Don Robinson of the *Register-Guard* is afflicted with the egocentric notion that the top—no, the only—kind of jobs in journalism are those in the "newsroom." Gallo's use of Robinson's expert opinion in the broad context of jobs in journalism seems a bit misguided. To say that a person has to be some sort of reporter to say something defies fundamental tenets of basic communication.

Even John-boy Walton knows that a "no talented journalist is ever unemployed."

Joshen Hagberg  
Journalism graduate  
Monday, February 2, 1976