

ACT needs full control

The students who inhabit the 218-unit tract of World War II temporary housing known as the Amazon housing project want to manage the project themselves. They're convinced they could do a better job of it than the University Housing Department.

Amazon's history of tenant unionism goes back to May, 1972, when residents organized the Amazon Cooperative Tenants Union (ACT) to fight a proposed rent hike. ACT appealed to the State Board of Higher Education and won its case.

Since then ACT has been a strong organization with a broad base of resident support. In June, 1976, ACT became a non-profit corporation, the Amazon Community Tenants.

The fledgeling corporation was established as the body that would, with University approval, assume responsibility for managing the Amazon housing project.

University approval seemed imminent two months ago when a task force appointed by President Boyd reviewed the ACT proposal and approved it. Gerald Bogen, Vice President for Student Affairs, expects to announce the administration's decision in a week or two, after he's had a chance to review the task force's conclusions and a report submitted by the Housing Department.

Neither Bogen nor the Housing Department will say what the substance of the report is, but it's a safe bet that it recommends substantial — perhaps crippling — changes in the ACT proposal.

ACT members fear the administration may allow them to lease and manage the Amazon project but refuse to give them control of Amazon's share of the building repair reserve. Amazon's share of the reserve is about \$70,000 — more than the Housing Department may be willing to part with. Withholding the reserve would give ACT management responsibilities without the wherewithal to carry them out.

When the administration is deciding the question of how much control to give the ACT it should consider student interests, not the interests of the Housing Department. After all, the Housing Department is supposed to serve the students, and if any group of students is well enough organized to serve themselves, the Housing Department should get out of the way.

ACT members anticipate a \$10 a month rent decrease under resident control. They could establish their own priorities in day care, maintenance, community centers and the like. And of course there is the undeniable benefit of community pride in running one's own show.

The University should approve the ACT proposal and give residents control of their share of the building repair reserve. This would make the Amazon project a better place to live and would end the University's role as a slum landlord.

Creating disunity

It is a disappointment to find that the Sociology Department is threatening to refuse to participate in the Academic Opportunities Program come winter term. This action on the part of the Sociology Department is a perfect example of playing into the hands of the University Administration.

If we examine the tactics which the administration is conducting, such as the creation of the Planning Committee (on Minority and Disadvantaged Students) whose sole goal is to make recommendations rather than making a final decision on the controversial issue, we find that the Committee will be only able to resolve this problem partially.

One will discover that the objective of the administration is to create frustration and disunity among those groups that are most affected by the issue. From the feeling of frustration we can assume there is a feeling of powerlessness.

From this feeling of powerlessness one is able to observe that programs (i.e. "Minority Programs") will deteriorate. Leaving the program in a state of stagnation which can only lead to the eventual elimination of an adequate program. It is frightening to feel that we, the students of this University, are powerless; it is worse to read that the Sociology Department feels the same.

It is important that we decide that when the administration creates these planning committees or ad hoc committees that the final decision will come from these committees, not from the administration.

If the Sociology Department wishes to help us, it is important for the department to explain to the University Community what tactics the University Administration are playing. Until then we must be careful not to fall into their hands. Unfortunately there seems to be a tendency for us to fall into their trap.

Letters

Let us outline the tactics which are being used and then go around them, if possible let us eliminate the tactics then move forward. Until we begin to outline the tactics we will remain stagnated, powerless, and useless.

Eric Wright
Economics, sophomore

No thanks, Gallo

An Open Letter to Donna Kunowsky, Mark Rose, and Dan Antoni, Gallo Social Consultants.

I belatedly received your invitation to a Gallo wine-tasting at the Phi Kappa Psi House on Nov. 2. Had I received your invitation sooner, I would have respectfully declined.

While I mean no disrespect to you, and bear no personal animosities, the issue for me is one of conscience and social ethics.

The United Farmworkers have waged a most difficult and protracted fight for the right to a democratic union which protects their interests.

They have been consistently and often viciously opposed by the Gallo Brothers, who, it is safe to say, seek to crush the UFW.

It takes very little insight to understand the severity of the lives led by these farmworkers. It also takes very little investigation to realize the importance of the UFW in bringing about a change in these truly dehumanizing conditions.

Again, I reiterate that I have no quarrel with you. However, I am fundamentally opposed to the Gallo attack on farmworkers and the UFW. I'm afraid that I can't go along with a Gallo public relations effort whose conscious objective is the breaking of the union boycott and the smashing of the UFW.

I appreciate your effort. But I know that Gallo will give no quarter in this struggle. Fortunately, where there is oppression, there always is resistance. May that resistance surge forward like a mighty tide to victory.

Gary Y. Kim
graduate, Public Affairs
ASUO Vice-President for
University Affairs

Readers rational

I saw a Pan Am ad, and didn't rush out to book a flight. I saw a Ken-L-Ration ad, and didn't rush out for a 50-pound bag. I saw a Gallo Wine ad, and didn't even get the urge to rush out for a jug.

Whether it was because of political reasons or because I just don't happen to like Gallo Wine is beside the point. The point is: an advertisement attempts to persuade (as we all do), but it cannot coerce a rational being into buying what it is selling.

Do the Eugene Friends of the Farmworkers refuse to recognize us (the readers of the ODE) as rational beings? Then why the rabid fear of a mere ad?

Is Nancy Bird afraid that if she sees another Gallo ad, she might, herself, lose control and sneak a run to Safeway?

Bird is advocating something far more insidious than Gallo is. She is advocating censorship.

Freedom of Speech is safeguarded only as long as the views coincide with your own? There's a popular term for that. And I am more inclined to be wary of those who wish to censor than I am of those who would be censored.

The only funny thing about censorship is that, once it is loosed upon the world, it really has no sense of loyalty. First it might be on your side, but it has a strange way of crossing lines. Someday, you might find yourself silenced by the same beast that you untamed.

I would rather come to an action through choice, rather than through the lack of choice. I don't want to be lowered to the same plane with the mallard who "chooses" to migrate in the fall.

I would not like the ODE to set a precedent for censoring a voice because of political reasons. And I am greatly offended by those who would.

Boycott Gallo, if you choose. But don't boycott my freedom to choose.

Jeanine Holly
Senior

Letters policy

The Emerald will accept and try to print all letters to the editor up to 250 words long. Longer letters may be printed by special arrangement. Handwritten letters go straight to the second priority file. Letters must be double-spaced and typed 65 characters to the line. All letters must include the author's signature. If your signature is illegible please type or print your name beneath it. Major, class rank and phone number must also be included.

Wednesday, November 10, 1976

opinion

Gallo ad ban - political censorship

Members of the UFW Solidarity Committee and the Eugene Friends of UFW Farmworkers may think they have the right to attack any obstacle enroute to furthering their cause.

They may think they have the right to continually remove hard facts out of context and interpret them to promote "la causa."

And they may think they can libel and slander the name of the E & J Gallo Winery from here to Cesar Chavez's front porch just because it is the largest winery in the United States.

We all have the unalienable right of free thought.

But when they propose political censorship of the Daily Emerald (as was called for in an opinion column in the Emerald Nov. 5, regarding a ban on Gallo advertising), I question whether these folks think at all.

In the opinion column submitted by members of the campus UFW political advocacy groups, a ban on Gallo advertisements in the Daily Emerald was demanded on the grounds that the ads are part of a media blitz of extraordinary nature.

It's hard to believe that this small political interest has taken upon itself the task of newspaper censorship.

It's hard to believe that this same group realistically asserts that the Daily Emerald abandon its journalistic ethics and commitment to social responsibility by allowing political philosophies to determine what students on this campus will — and will not — read.

Proposing an advertising ban is advocating political censorship and that should not sit well with any of us.

Our First Amendment rights guarantee the right to a full exposure of a wide realm of ideas. Each of us have the right to know, as well as speak all sides of any issue.

Our basic rights are infringed upon by proposals such as the one to ban advertising because of political opposition by one small activist group.

Suppose every political advocacy group on campus asserted the right to censor newspapers to further their respective causes. The Daily Emerald could be reduced to the personal column if it was to yield to outside political pressure.

Similar UFW political activist groups have gone to greater extent in attempts to interfere with students rights on California college campuses. A case in point are the events that took place at Hayward State last year. Demands for Gallo advertising bans resulted in threats of physical abuse to the newspaper staff and the theft of 8,000 copies of the Pioneer (campus newspaper).

As a result of such incidents (there were many), the California Freedom of Information Committee and the California Newspaper Publishers' Association condemned the actions of anti-Gallo wine advertising as constituting "a serious threat to the existence of a free campus press and consequently a dangerous precedent to the exercise of free expression by all . . ."

The New York Times states: "In furtherance of the objectives of the First Amendment of the Constitution, advertising columns should be kept open to all points of view . . ."

Furthermore, I heartily support the open policy of the Daily Emerald to present all sides of the issues.

But I condemn the efforts of the UFW advocacy groups that continue to undermine the integrity of the Daily Emerald's editorial page and advertising columns by proposing political censorship and continuing to misrepresent Gallo's role in the union jurisdictional dispute. (To cite one example, the Teamsters Union represents farmworkers at the Gallo Ranch, therefore Gallo is not a "scab" or nonunion advocate as they contend.)

Just as the UFW is not the only union successfully representing farmworkers in California vineyards, the UFW point of view on union representation of farmworkers is not the whole ball of wax.

I encourage the Daily Emerald to continue the free flow of information and the student body not to support any activity of these UFW activist groups — including their alleged secondary boycott of Gallo wines.

Mark W. Rose
Senior-Journalism
Campus Representative
E & J Gallo Winery