

Letters

Totally mobbed

I am very happy to announce a new registered group on campus, The Eugene Friends of Gallo. The sole purpose of the EFG volunteer members is to inform the "other side" about the Gallo Boycott. Students need or should demand to know both sides of any issue to make any kind of rational or logical decision.

An incident occurred this Friday when our table was first set up on the EMU terrace. After displaying two signs, one to identify the group and the other sign to state our purpose, a situation occurred which I thought would never happen. Within half an hour I was totally mobbed, which I did expect, but what happened afterwards I did not expect. Members of the opposing group tore down both signs and took some buttons. I was intimidated as a human being and told, "if you do this again, something will happen..." Is the opposing group afraid of the other side of the issue? I can only conclude yes. What about the freedom of speech? What about my rights as a fellow student, let alone a person? It was stated by a member of the other group that "the Teamsters are bad; they muscle their way into anything they want and this is bad." My God, they are condemning the Teamsters for the same tactics they displayed on me as a volunteer member of the Eugene Friends of Gallo on the EMU terrace. I guess the freedom of speech goes to the group that can threaten.

The other group is more than welcome to set up a table right next to ours or picket in front of our table if they wish. The goal of the Eugene Friends of Gallo is only to give the "other" side and not lower ourselves to that of an animal by making threats!

Dan Antoni
Eugene Friends of Gallo
gen. sci., sr.

Surprise move

Ever since Sacajawea, 'pioneers' have been taking credit for women's work. District Attorney J. Pat Horton has claimed "pioneer" status in reforming the rape law. On behalf of the many women whose collective efforts led to the legislature changing the rape laws, I would like to set the record straight.

Prior to the 1975 legislative session a coalition of women's groups began holding meetings concerning rape law reform—these included the Oregon Women's Political Caucus, the American Civil Liberties Union, Oregon Council for Women's Equality and the National Organization of Women. These groups studied laws from other states. Bills were drafted and submitted to both House and Senate through the friendly offices of law makers like Ed and Nancie Fadeley and Betty Browne who were committed to rape law reform.

Mr. Horton had indicated an interest in rape law reform and attended one of the Women's Coalition meetings. He then drafted and submitted a bill of his own on rape, which was unacceptable to the Women's Coalition because it allowed a rape victim's sexual conduct with third parties to be brought in if it had occurred within one year of the alleged rape.

The day before the House Judiciary hearings on the bills were

to be held, I personally met with Mr. Horton along with five other women and asked him to support S.B. 429 which was the Oregon Women's Political Caucus' rape bill. The testimony was overwhelmingly in favor of eliminating evidence of the victim's past sexual life with third parties.

At that time, in a surprise move, Mr. Horton withdrew support of his own bill and asked the House judiciary committee to support S.B. 429 as the "best bill."

It is true Mr. Horton had shown an early interest in rape law reform, but he has done a disservice by not acknowledging the role that the Coalition of Women's Rights Groups played in bringing about the change in the rape law. It was women who drafted the bills (H.B. 2241 and 2242 and S.B. 429) that were combined to make the existing law; it was women who developed the strategy, lobbied, gathered witnesses, and marshaled the political support for the bills.

It appears that Mr. Horton is attempting to take credit for these women's efforts in order to further his own political career. This is particularly irritating since Mr. Horton allowed the Lane Interagency Rape Team funding to be jeopardized by being one of the law enforcement administrators who give it such a low priority.

Margie Hendriksen
pres., Oregon Women's
Political Caucus
1990 Dogwood
Eugene, Oregon

Choice genuine

The current ASUO election has been marred by much mudslinging, the result of which can only detract voter attention away from the issues and qualifications of each of the candidates for president.

There is too much at stake for our selection of a president to be based on petty and unsubstantiated charges. In this election for ASUO president, we have a genuine choice between candidates who stand for contrasting viewpoints on what direction our student association should take.

While Jan Oliver characterizes herself as a "program advocate," we have in Jim Davis a candidate who pledges to serve the interests of all students as consumers of education. While Jan Oliver's public statements consist of vague and general declarations such as "improving communication," Jim Davis offers students concrete services such as stopping tuition increases through work at the Legislature and publishing a course information booklet which will include evaluation data.

I am acquainted with each of the candidates and am sure that each is sincere and would make a good faith effort to serve the students. What the choice comes down to is which has demonstrated knowledge of the important issues facing us in the coming year. That is why I support Jim Davis for ASUO president.

Mark Cogan
ASUO administrative assistant
for legislative affairs

opinion

Life or death question

Editor's note: The following open letter to Gov. Straub is reprinted from the May issue of the Oregon Times magazine by permission of the editor, Tom Bates.

Dear Governor Straub,

You know it and we know it: This is not an easy time to govern. You've indicated several times that you don't enjoy the power of your office, and that's understandable. But there comes a time when you have to take a stand.

The issue today is not something like "jobs or the environment," where you can duck and say "both." The question is life or death, and you just can't have Dennis Banks and kill him, too.

Yes, there is room for doubt. But it is a very small room. You have seen the sworn affidavits, and you've seen my articles on the situation in South Dakota. So you've heard the joke that in South Dakota it's "more dangerous to go fishing without a license than to kill an Indian." And you've heard that there are at least a thousand white men in South Dakota "who would consider themselves heroes if they shot Dennis Banks dead."

You know they are waiting for him in the penitentiary. And you know about the Honorable William Janklow, recently elected attorney general of South Dakota.

What kind of man is this Janklow, who has asked you the favor of returning Banks to his custody, and who asked our judges to set bail at \$500,000 on a man who has never harmed another human being?

Put it this way: What kind of man would hire a 15-year-old Indian girl to babysit, offer her a ride home afterward, and rape her on the way? What kind of man would be driving down the wrong side of the road, drunk, nude from the waist down, and then assault the officer who arrests him, shouting, "No son-of-a-bitch Indian can arrest me"?

But the really disturbing question is, what kind of society would elect such a man to be its highest judicial officer? The sad fact is that Janklow ran on his anti-Indian, anti-AIM record, and won a landslide victory. One of his strongest planks was his successful prosecution of Dennis Banks, as a result of which Banks is now a "fugitive."

Ironically, Janklow is also a "fugitive" from Dennis Banks, who prosecuted him on the rape charge before the Rosebud Sioux Tribal Court. The court found him guilty and issued a warrant for his arrest, which Janklow has so far evaded.

Does Janklow want justice or revenge? Janklow told a law student at a party that "The only way to solve the AIM problem is to shoot the AIM leaders." Mentioning "Dennis Banks" by name, he added, "Put a bullet in a guy's head and he won't bother you anymore."

Maybe that's just "party talk." Maybe Banks won't get killed. We're back to probabilities. Look at it this way: Of the AIM members arrested in Oregon last fall, one was returned to South Dakota. That one, Anna Mae Aquash, is now dead.

The authorities said she died of "exposure." A

second autopsy, demanded by her family after she had been put in a nameless grave, revealed that she had died of a .38 caliber bullet fired at point blank range into the back of her head.

So, one for one. As a sports fan, I think you'll agree that's a pretty high average. And in South Dakota, you don't even need a license.

It's not just South Dakota. Bob, your own State Troopers fired on a man they thought was Dennis Banks. He had not fired at them. Dennis Banks hasn't fired at anybody. What is so hateful about this man? "Riot where arson is committed" is the charge for which Banks faces 15 years in South Dakota.

The Custer courthouse did burn down. Janklow never proved that Banks rioted or lit the fire—only that he was there. Sure he was there. He was there for a meeting with the judge.

Sarah Bad Heart Bull was there, too, because her son had been knifed to death by a white man and the man was only charged with second degree manslaughter. She came weeping to the courthouse and troopers threw her down the stairs. She got three-to-five. The murderer of her son got two months probation.

And Dennis Banks, convicted by an all-white jury after Janklow warned his court-appointed lawyer not to do a good job, ran for his life, which is now in your hands.

It must be a big temptation for you to wait and see what happens in federal court. If Banks is convicted on the firearms charge, the feds will take him off your hands. Then maybe the American Indian Movement would go away and leave Oregon alone. That is what people expect you to do. You even have a precedent: Gov. Jerry Brown sat on the issue until it went away.

But you have another precedent closer to home. When a young black named Ronnie Williams fled to Oregon from the Alabama pen, where his life was in danger because he had exposed its corruption, Tom McCall didn't mess around. And Ronnie has become a valued member of our community.

You ran for office on a pledge to continue the McCall tradition. Now you have a chance to show some gumption, and I think you will—because I think people underestimate you. More precisely, it is your sense of decency that will compel you to deny this South Dakota rapist who wants you to help him silence a good man.

Make no mistake about it: Dennis Banks does not wear gold and feathers, but in his profound humility the mark of the leader is clearly visible. That is why he is hunted.

As press deadline would have it, I'm writing this on Easter Sunday and can't help thinking of another governor who was asked to condemn a man in whom he could find no guilt.

The world and its history are waiting. Will you, Governor Straub, wash your hands of Dennis Banks?

Tom Bates, edit
Oregon Times
1000 S.W. 3rd Ave.
Portland, Oregon

Little value

I think anonymous opinions and "communications" are of little value, and pernicious in a university setting. I resist questionnaires. I am actually paid to profess and would welcome person-to-person exchange: existence of a university depends upon it. I teach studio classes. By their nature, these classes involve incessant, person-to-person, reciprocal evaluations of performance, outlook and accomplishment.

Computerized statistical information which (by definition) ignores the range of educational assumptions implicit in personal evaluations is information very thin by comparison with that which we enjoy in my area. Some may need it, but all should take care that the technocratization of such evaluative discourse does not make the meeting of minds in this place even more difficult.

Why not budget for a staff of persons you choose for their good judgment and good character and

then have them audit classes, and publish their signed evaluations? In this way, true discourse could only be promoted—and none would have his academic ratings jeopardized.

Studio classes, tutorial relations, seminars, etc. then could maintain the strengths of personal give-and-take in evaluating each other's views without the depersonalizing effect of questionnaires and computerized tabulations.

If you happen to be one of those bemused into supposing yourself a "consumer" of education (rather than the producer of a unique education), then we could have much to resolve between us—

consider the "principle of self-fulfilling prophecy."

David Stannard
associate prof, applied arts

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 250 words, typed, triple-spaced, dated and signed with the person's major. No unsigned letters will be published. Longer opinion columns will be published whenever possible after being submitted to the editorial page editor. The limit on opinion columns is 800 words, using the same format as letters.

Not endorsed

A letter ("Concern known") by Ann Penny, printed on Monday's editorial page, claims that the Eugene League of Women's Voters endorsed the candidacy of Nancy Hayward. The league does not endorse Ms. Hayward. The league is a non-partisan political organization and as such does not endorse or publicly support any political candidate.