

## Diet upsets

The traditional political diet of big money donations and enormous campaign budgets does not set well with the American people anymore. They voiced their distress after the 1974 elections by demanding campaign reforms. And Congress obliged by passing the fair campaign practices act. The advantages of having enough money to run a high-powered campaign are undeniable. The candidate with limited financial resources just can't expect to get the same amount of name exposure as a candidate with the money for TV spot ads, bill boards and newspaper. Federal funding for major national campaigns was an attempt to establish financial equity among candidates. At the University a similar type of equity is needed.

The ASUO elections board has set a \$500 limit on campaign spending for ASUO presidential candidates. This figure isn't excessively large when one considers that the cost of printing pamphlets and brochures can run in the neighborhood of \$200. Add the cost of newspaper advertising and posters to this \$200 and the limit is soon reached. No matter what campaigning techniques are used, it costs money to reach 16,500 voters.

The amount of money candidates spend can directly affect their chances of getting elected, especially in a close race where name familiarity could make the difference. Given this political reality, campaigns can hinge on how much money is spent. For this money some student candidates can look to political backers, special interest groups, friends, family, personal savings or even bank loans. For others there are simply no resources.

If ASUO presidential elections are to be as democratic as possible, campaign funds must be made available to those candidates without financial resources. The *Emerald* is not advocating that such funds be given away. These funds should be given in the form of a loan to candidates that are willing to accept the responsibility of incurring the debt and repaying it.

The money for the loans could be appropriated from the ASUO budget or the ASUO could co-sign individual bank loans. The loan, however, should not be made in a lump sum. Candidates wishing to, could receive a maximum of \$250 for the primary elections. Those candidates making it into the general elections could claim the remaining \$250.

This proposal is not the only possible plan for making such funds available. Rather, it is offered to encourage students to recognize the inequity of poorly-funded candidates running against financially well-backed candidates. Campaign spending is a political reality. The question should be, where would voters rather see the money come from: publicly sponsored funds or special interest manipulators.

## Letters

### Freshness needed

In the campaign literature of Jim Davis, both the Survival Center and SEARCH have been misrepresented as firm supporters of his latest bid for ASUO power.

We wish to make it clear that in the past Mr. Davis has shown little support for our programs and even less understanding of our purposes.

Communication between Mr. Davis and our programs has consisted of little more than Xerox memos full of bureaucratic jargon and rhetoric.

Now is the only time we can make a change which would bring about effective management of student programs. The best way we see to bring about this change is to elect Jan Oliver to the position of ASUO president.

Ms. Oliver has proven to be both personable and up-front in her dealings with programs; she has impressed us with her ready accessibility and creative potential. What she does not know or understand about needs or directions, she has demonstrated a willingness to investigate and learn.

Our first hand impression of Ms. Oliver's performance concerning student interests has been one of fair and mature decision-making, coupled with a sense of honesty and forthrightness.

We feel that the student government of the University is desperately in need of the freshness, vitality and the spirit of mutual cooperation, which Ms. Oliver has exhibited through her past performances in student affairs.

It is in this light that we strongly urge each concerned individual to examine thoroughly the issues at hand in this upcoming election and vote for Jan Oliver.

**Richard Wilhelm**  
director, SEARCH  
**Michael McClellan**  
director, Survival Center  
**Ruyle Spiller**  
assistant director, SEARCH  
**Michael Connelly**  
seminar leader, SEARCH

### Coverage thanked

Just a note to say we particularly appreciate your day to day coverage of the National Library Week Celebration, the highlight of which was Ken Kesey's lecture and that of Prof. William Handy. Thanks!

**Sue Riemer**  
program director



WAGH  
COPY THE ORIGINAL GRAPHIC, OPS

## Farm workers support refused

Two weeks ago the *Emerald* began printing Carlo Rossi wine advertisements. Carlo Rossi is a brand name used by the E & J Gallo Winery. All Gallo wines are being boycotted by the United Farm Workers (UFW) union. These Carlo Rossi ads are part of a nationwide advertising campaign by the Gallo brothers, who are attempting to break through the UFW boycott and buy their way back into the college market. Running these ads, without some significant demonstration of support for the UFW, allies the *Emerald* with the Gallo brothers, California agribusiness and the Teamster leadership in their campaign to smash the UFW.

Over the past three years the UFW boycott has significantly affected the sale of Gallo wines. Sales have slipped 10 per cent each of the past two years and a recent Harris poll revealed that more than 11 million Americans are actively supporting the Gallo boycott. The Gallos have fought the boycott by bringing out new wines, like their varietal series and Madria Madria Sangria, and by drastically increasing their already fat multi-million dollar advertising budget. However, their ads do not emphasize the Gallo name. Ernest and Julio prefer instead to run hokey advertisements for Carlo Rossi and Red Mountain wines, hoping the public will not recognize them as Gallo products.

Clearly, Gallo farm workers depend on the boycott to win back their jobs and to make the Gallos negotiate a new contract with the UFW. When the Gallos refused to sign their third three-year contract with the UFW in 1973 and signed instead with the Teamsters, virtually all of the Gallo farm workers went out on strike. They were all fired. For three years now, Gallo grapes have been harvested by a shifting crew of workers hired by Teamster labor contractors. These workers have none of the protections of a UFW contract. Three Gallo field workers have been killed in the past year due to unsafe conditions and none of the present workers has protection from pesticides, has job security, a guarantee of sanitary working conditions or seniority rights. The original Gallo farm workers will never get their jobs back until the Gallo brothers are forced to negotiate with them. It should be evident to anyone that printing ads which promote the sale of any Gallo wine directly hurts these workers and sets back the UFW boycott.

The *Emerald* was not forced to accept Gallo advertising. These ads could have been refused as an expression of support for the UFW. The ads could have been accepted, to avoid any charges of censorship, and support for the UFW indicated simply by donating the Gallo revenue to the UFW clinic and retirement center. The *Emerald* could also have declared a policy of "neutrality" in cases involving labor disputes and refused advertising from both sides, much as the State Employment Division refuses to refer unemployed workers to plants where a strike is in progress. Instead, the *Emerald* refused to support the UFW and accepted money that is being used to continue the exploitation of Gallo farm workers. The

*Emerald* did this despite the continually-demonstrated support of students for the UFW.

The crux of the problem is that the *Emerald* no longer supports the UFW. For two years, from the start of the boycott in 1973 until this year, the *Emerald* gave editorial support to the farm worker movement and never printed a Gallo ad. This year, however, the editors have excluded practically all mention of the UFW and local support groups from the paper. They have not covered our rallies, our picket lines, our petition campaign or even our exhibit of Chicano art. All of these events were simply declared "not newsworthy." The editors have avoided printing national news about the UFW as well. For seven months, not a word appeared about the historic California Agricultural Labor Relations Act, which resulted in almost 400 ranch representation elections this past fall and winter. Not a word appeared about how the UFW won the great majority of those elections and how the growers then killed the law by cutting off funding for it in the state legislature. And certainly not a word about the UFW's new boycott of Sun Maid raisins, Sunsweet prunes and Diamond nuts, which was called in response to the ALRA defunding vote. Only now, after signing a contract to print Gallo ads, has the *Emerald* decided that the UFW is newsworthy.

The *Emerald* may indeed feel a "commitment" to publish Gallo ads, but it is not a commitment that grows out of any concern for professional standards or belief in free speech. It is rather a direct consequence of the editors' opposition to the farm workers' movement. That opposition has kept the UFW out of the *Emerald's* news columns for nearly seven months. Now the editors have gone even further and decided to insert Gallo wine in the paper's advertising section. The only thing the *Emerald* has not done is to openly declare its hostility to the UFW on its editorial page. The editors have not done this because they realize how unpopular such a position would be. The *Emerald* should stop hiding behind the platitudes of liberal journalism and explain why it has abandoned the farm workers.

The *Emerald* will be running its Gallo advertisements for three more weeks. Unfortunately, the UFW does not have the millions of dollars the Gallo brothers are sinking into national advertising in student newspapers. So we must ask you now to remember that all wines bottled in Modesto, California are Gallo wines. They include Andre Champagne, Boone's Farm, Carlo Rossi, Eden Roc, Madria Madria Sangria, Paisano, Red Mountain, Ripple, Spanada, Thunderbird, Tyrolia and Wolfe & Son. Remember these names and read the label when you buy wine. And remember the farm workers who are struggling for decent working conditions and the chance to earn a decent living through the UFW. They deserve your support.

VIVA LA CAUSA!

**UFW Solidarity Committee**  
**Eugene Friends of the Farm Workers**  
**Kirt Willcox**  
**Phyllis Wagoner**