

Letters

Celebrity hype

Though frankly lacking in style and content, your article of Oct. 22 concerning college speaker programming was a triumph for exposing the con game which celebrities and their promoters are playing with students' money.

But more than that, I am grateful for knowing that Cultural Forum scheduler Ed Reed refuses to play the big-money game and is working hard to bring us speakers who won't rip us off. Most celebs who are making the campus tour circuit — whether John Wooden, Alice Cooper, or Howdy Doody — cannot be excelled for their cupidity, nor can the students who dish out the bucks to hear them, for their stupidity. Any speaker who charges more than a dollar a head to fill a lecture hall with hot air and ego should be boycotted. Unfortunately, the average college student is just gullible enough to willfully have his pockets emptied by a crook clothed in radical-chic such as John Dean.

It's nice to know that Reed, a guy who sounds like he's cornered the market on common sense, is fighting to keep us out of that trap of celebrity-hype. Dedication like his is hard to find on any campus. We are lucky to have him working for our interests.

Dave Anderson
Senior, Political Science

Narrow landslide

Weinstein beat Parkhurst by accumulating 7 per cent more votes. Rust beat Elliot by a margin of 4 per cent. I find it rather dis-

tressing, therefore, that you should have represented Weinstein's win as a landslide, while implying that Rust just managed to squeak by. Notice your language: "Jerry Rust narrowly defeated . . . Frank Elliot." "Rust was slipping by Elliot, Archie Weinstein was leaping past John Parkhurst." "Weinstein buried Parkhurst in the race." It does not seem to me that Weinstein's margin of victory was sufficiently wider than Rust's to warrant such a disparity in the force of your descriptions.

I have elected to color my copy of this particular issue of the Emerald yellow — and I advise all readers with an ear for language to do the same.

Rod Jenks
Graduate-Philosophy

Charges unfair

Eek! There reeks in Tuesday's paper a sour editorial in a vat of distortions concerning Ms. Bird's propagandized attack of Gallo wines.

Nancy Bird talks of misrepresentations in the winery's rebuttal to the Emerald's political cartoon. I say look at your own. Bird stated the union contract between Gallo Winery and the United Farmworker's Union expired in July 1973. In actuality, the contract terminated on April 1973. I can even go farther by giving you the exact day, April 18th. This can be easily documented by both the Gallo Winery and the UFW union. Most important, Mr. Solomon did not state that Gallo Winery has a 30-year union history of farm



I'd like one of those \$35,000 desk jobs with a retirement pension, medical plan, and my own parking space.

worker representation. He stated that Gallo Winery has a 30-year history of unionization . . . period!

My advice to you, Ms. Bird, is three fold: one, get your facts correct; two, take a course on the consequences of taking material out of context; and finally, learn how to read. Printing such rubbish can only be believable to people like yourself, not the intellectual colleagues at the University of Oregon.

Dan Antoni
Senior-Gen. Sci./Education
Gallo Rep. at the U of Oregon

The following prison inmates have asked the Emerald to invite students to correspond with them.

John L. Wright 124730
P.O. Box 787
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility
Lucasville, Ohio 45648

Ron Williams 38221
2605 State St.
Salem, Oregon 97310

Perry Allen Stebelton
251-082
P.O. Box 520
Walla Walla, Wash. 99362

Jeff Hensley
Josephine County Jail
Grants Pass, Ore. 97526

opinion

opinion

opinion

Gallo distorts facts about conditions, benefits

For the past several weeks, the Daily Emerald has been running Gallo ads, a practice which the paper resumed last year in defiance of student support for the United Farmworkers Union. The Gallo advertisements decidedly are not ordinary cases of corporate advertising. They are a continuation of last spring's media blitz directed at college newspapers.

Gallo has indicated it will lavish \$40,000 in advertising on 50 campus newspapers this fall; these ads being designed to counteract the effects of the union boycott against this scab producer. The boycott has been the chief means by which farmworkers have made themselves heard above Gallo's propaganda machine.

Many newspapers, such as the UCLA Daily Bruin, refused to handle Gallo ads, since Gallo had been charged with unfair labor practices in hearings held before the Agricultural Labor Relations Board. The Emerald should follow suit especially in light of the fact that Gallo not only denies its farmworkers freedom of speech in choosing their own union, but uses the most distorted propaganda to disguise the vicious working conditions of Gallo employees.

The October 25th letter to the editor (Cartoon unfair) is a case in point. Written by the "Communications Director" for E & J Gallo Winery, the letter purports to show the numerous benefits which Gallo workers receive at this workers' paradise. Among these benefits are "a paid pension, paid vacation, paid holidays, premium paid overtime, paid life and health insurance, including major medical for the family." Permanent Gallo workers are supposed to average over \$9,000 a year while seasonal workers rake in the whopping average of \$5.18 per hour.

This is nonsense! The "facts" as stated are misrepresentations in the extreme. For example, the average salary of permanent workers defended by Gallo is derived from averaging the salaries of foremen, supervisors, and security personnel with that of farmworkers. The seasonal workers' average salary is just that — seasonal. During the peak harvest season workers put in long overtime hours to make those high wages. When harvest season ends, however, the fat wages vanish, and migrant workers are forced to move on to other jobs if and when they are available. Moreover, in some cases deductions for "miscellaneous expenses" such as corporate-

provided housing are extracted from paychecks. In sum, no one suggests seriously that seasonal workers are able to support themselves on the wages earned during this brief harvest season — except maybe Gallo.

We are led to believe that farmworkers enjoy great "finge benefits" also. The truth is that the major benefits listed apply only to full time employees and not migrant workers. Only approximately ten or fifteen per cent of Gallo workers qualify. The health and welfare provisions apply only when a worker has worked 80 hours the preceding month. Moreover, from past experience we know that the benefits listed in Teamster contracts such as the one now in force at Gallo are worth only as much as the paper they're written on. The UFW contracts, however, provide full health and welfare benefits to workers who have worked for 90 days for any employer under contract to the union. Equally important, the workers themselves enforce the contract provisions.

What Gallo will not talk about are the provisions left out of the contracts. Foremost among these are safety and health conditions. In the Teamster contracts there are no protections against harmful pesticide spraying in the fields, or provisions for protective clothing. The Teamsters rely on state and federal laws to protect workers although these laws are almost never enforced, and at best they are mere reprimands for corporate violations. Last year three Gallo workers were killed because of unsafe working conditions. As a result, Gallo was fined \$215 for violations of the California safety code. To prevent such tragedies, the UFW insists that protections be a part of any contract so that workers can enforce safeguards relating to their health and safety.

The Teamster contracts do not require a union hall and as a result hiring and firing is done by Teamster labor contractors or by Gallo. Among farmworkers, the labor contractor is the most hated vestige of the exploitation they have had to endure at the hands of agribusiness. Under this system no protections are accorded to older workers since seniority and job security are decided by Gallo. Under Teamster contracts child labor is permitted in the fields and the elected ranch committees by which workers democratically participate in the enforcement of contract provisions are eliminated.

The most fundamental point at stake in this struggle is the question of democracy in the fields. Gallo contends that it is 100 per cent union, and has been since 1967. The

truth is that Gallo denied its workers the right to choose their own union in 1973 when it signed a Teamster contract. No workers voted for the Teamsters. Gallo simply signed a piece of paper and announced that the workers were hereafter Teamsters, ignoring the clearly expressed worker sentiment for the UFW as evidenced by the two previous UFW contracts with Gallo from 1967 to 1973. When the farmworkers struck over this outrageous action, they were fired.

Then, in 1975 when elections were finally held under the California Agricultural Labor Relations Act, Gallo did all it could to prevent a fair election. Teamster and company supervisors campaigned together in violation of state labor laws. Gallo machinery and equipment had "Vote Teamsters" bumper stickers. Gallo was also charged by the Agricultural Labor Relations Board with numerous examples of "interfering with UFW organizers by the massive use of photographing, intruding into private conversations and other tactics." Finally, Gallo denied the original strikers the right to vote in the election, knowing full well that if these workers were allowed to exercise their democratic rights, the UFW would win. Since the ALRB ran out of funds last winter (due to the extensive lobbying efforts against such funding by growers like Gallo) no decision has yet been reached on this disputed election. So farmworkers still do not have the right to choose their own union.

There is a way to stop this exploitation by Gallo. You can boycott all Gallo wines (all wines made in Modesto, California, including Carlo Rossi, Thunderbird, Eden Roc, Boone's Farm, Spanada, Tyrolia, Ripple, Andre, Red Mountain, Madria Madria Sangria, and of course Gallo). Gallo is very sensitive to such consumer solidarity with farmworkers. That is the reason for its ads. By boycotting Gallo you will be voting for democracy in the fields and against corporate exploitation. The Daily Emerald could join this boycott by refusing to run Gallo ads.

It is a simple choice between human rights and corporate profits. Vote for social justice. Boycott Gallo. Viva la causa!

Nancy Bird,
Eugene Friends of the Farmworkers
Bill Ratteree
UFW Solidarity Committee
Friday, November 5, 1976