

Smith invites civil war

Rhodesian Prime Minister Ian Smith never intended to transfer a significant measure of political power to his country's black majority. That became clear Monday when he rejected a settlement proposed by the British, thus effectively ending the negotiations that had passed through various stages of decay since last fall.

Smith is perfectly willing to allow blacks to run the government, so long as they agree to run it in a way that would not substantially affect the interests of the white minority.

Blacks in Rhodesia — or Zimbabwe, as we had better get used to calling it — see that the interests of the white ruling class cannot be maintained without sacrificing their own.

The United States and Great Britain have tried to promote some sort of compromise despite the basic conflict of black and white interests in Zimbabwe. Western business concerns would like to be able to trade with Zimbabwe without the stigma of racism that is currently attached to trade with Rhodesia. And the spread of avowedly anti-capitalist systems of government in Southern Africa has caused western policy makers to think that an accommodation with black nationalism in Zimbabwe should be reached before things get out of hand.

Ian Smith's government, however, is built upon a colonial structure that is incompatible with genuine black leadership. The strings that control the economy in Rhodesia are exclusively in the hands of whites — and those who control the economy control the nation. Majority rule in Zimbabwe would mean a massive re-distribution of wealth, and political power almost exclusively at the expense of the white minority.

Smith ended the negotiations for an orderly transition to black majority rule because he felt he was being asked to submit to a "Marxist indoctrinated minority." Of course any real re-distribution of wealth and political power sounds Marxist to whoever the wealth and power are going to be taken from. And Marxist or not, re-distribution of wealth and power is the only way to end oppression in Zimbabwe.

So Smith decided to play for all the marbles and thereby invited civil war. He transformed what might have been limited to a struggle for racial equality into a class war. Black guerrillas already control most of the countryside; Smith's government is secure only in the urban centers. The question is no longer whether the black majority will come to power but how long it will take and how many lives it will cost.

Now that the negotiations have broken down, the chief danger is that super-power contention of the Angolan variety might subvert the self-determination of the blacks in Zimbabwe. Black leaders are acutely aware of this danger and are taking care not to accept any aid with strings attached. If this independent position can be maintained through the civil war that now seems likely, we may at last see justice and liberty in Zimbabwe.



opinion

Gallo fair to farmworkers

An opinion column in the January 7 Daily Emerald indicated that boycotting Gallo will "assist the farm worker in obtaining the right to elections."

Additionally, the ASUO executives agreed to purchase advertising space for the UFW Union.

On the one hand, the ASUO waxes eloquent about "right of access" and then, in a kind of Star Chamber proceeding, deigned not to give Gallo access to a platform to present its case. Decisions regarding Gallo advertising were made without the ASUO ever having heard Gallo's petition.

The ASUO, therefore, has built its case upon a false premise that their support will guarantee secret ballot elections for farm workers. Such elections are already guaranteed by California law and have been since August, 1975.

In fact, on September 10, 1975, under rules and procedures established by the California Agricultural Labor Relations Board (ALRB), a state-supervised, secret ballot election was held for Gallo farm workers.

The results were: 223 votes for the Teamsters Union and 131 votes for the UFW Union.

But an additional 195 ballots were challenged by the Teamsters Union, the United Farm Workers Union, by Gallo, and by the ALRB election supervisors. ALRB hearings and an ALRB Regional Office investigation were conducted to determine the validity of the challenges. Only the ALRB can determine which union won. Neither Cesar Chavez, President of the UFW, nor Frank Fitzsimmons, President of the Teamsters, nor Gallo, (certainly no officer of ASUO) can affect the outcome. Continuing a boycott, therefore, serves no useful purpose.

This matter is not a case of union vs. non-union, but which union represents the 199 permanent and 300 seasonal Gallo farm workers. It is a union jurisdictional dispute with Gallo caught in the middle.

Indeed, for the past few months, the UFW Union and the Teamsters Union have been holding on-going discussions about the matter and may even have come to terms. This is where the dispute rightfully belongs — between the two competing unions.

Another point — in California, there is a law requiring that all monies spent for election campaigns be reported to the state. The Emerald opinions editorial unequivocally stated "Corporations outspent the UFW by a margin of at least 5 to 1." Again, someone in ASUO is getting misinformed. The UFW spent as much as "corporations." The UFW Union spent more than \$1 million in the battle of Proposition 13.

Now who is propagandizing whom?

Of the more than two million farm workers in the United States — less than 60,000 belong to a union — any union.

Gallo's farm workers have been unionized since 1967.

The 199 permanent and 300 seasonal union farm workers at Gallo are among the highest paid farm workers in the continental United States. Minimum wages are \$3.26 per hour up to \$4.25 per hour, depending upon job classification. In 1975, the average salary of permanent workers on the E. & J. Gallo Ranches was more than \$9,000, a higher salary than most starting Ph.D.'s, while seasonal workers averaged \$5.18 per hour.

The Gallo union farm workers enjoy the best fringe benefit package of farm workers anywhere, including paid pension, paid vacation, paid holidays, premium paid overtime, paid life insurance, and paid health insurance, including major medical for the entire family.

Only California farm workers via a farm labor law are guaranteed the right to secret ballot elections to choose a union.

Oregon has no such law. Should not the Daily Emerald be seeking such an NLRA-type law for Oregon farm workers, or endorsing such a law for farm workers on a national basis instead of supporting a boycott of a 100 per cent union Winery whose farm worker election is in the hands of an Agricultural Labor Relations Board?

Daniel J. Solomon
Communications Director
E. & J. Gallo Winery
Modesto, California

Letters

Relieved at death

In response to Mr. Warren's letter, Gilmore a Martyr: To make the claim that without the death penalty Gilmore's two victims might still be alive is really totally absurd. True, it didn't stop him from killing his victims, but nothing could have stopped this crazy maniac. But let me assure you that he will not kill anyone again.

The death penalty is not full of compassion or regard for human life. I agree. If Gilmore and the hundreds of others like him had any compassion or regard for human life then they would not have stuck a gun to the head of helpless innocent people and pulled the trigger just to watch the burst of blood and brains come out the other side. Why should they receive any more compassion than they gave to their victims?

So at 7:06 a.m. on Tuesday when those bullets pierced Gilmore's heart, I felt a little relieved (even happy) that one more psychopathic killer would not be around when all those 'goody two shoes humanists' let all the rapists, robbers, and murderers back out of their slimey hole to

again take their huge toll of innocent lives.

Steve Fogelson
Senior — Political Science

Killer to go free

May I correct your note which was appended to the letter from the friends of the murdered Eric Thede (ODE, 1-21-77). The killer was indeed convicted but was not sentenced to life in prison as you stated. He in fact received 20 years, a sentence which these days results in an average of five to seven years spent in prison (before release) according to my legal sources.

Thank goodness our prisoner rehabilitation programs are so effective, huh?

Brian Chapman
Graduate-Physical Education

Locals insensitive

I have recently listened to the concern about the number of minority faculty at this institution and how to remedy such a problem by attracting more. I would like to inform any and all concerned with one of the major problems

that any minority faculty might have in the area.

Since I came to Oregon in 1968, I have been stopped by state police, county sheriffs, and small town policemen who stated things like, "I just wanted to know what you were doing down here" (Charleston, Oregon when I was working on my doctoral dissertation), or "you didn't dim your headlights" (my headlights were already dim) to "I want to road check your car." They road checked it so often I finally just routinely handed them the checksheet when they came up to my car.

As a member of the faculty, my status showed no improvement. I was unable to purchase anything

in Coos Bay on a purchase order; I had to pay cash in advance. But the ultimate insult was when I went into the EMU to cash a \$5.10 check and because my picture was not on the back of my card he would not cash it. I do not believe that if I had been a white male member of the faculty I would have been so insulted. Not only did the young man at the counter refuse to honor my check but he smirked and seemed to delight in finding some technicality to turn down my request.

I really feel that if I had been purchasing some tremendous amount or writing a check for over \$100 (I showed him my courtesy card to no avail) there would have

been justification for this action.

However, when I returned to my office I asked the professor in the office next to mine if he had a picture on his ID. He showed it to me. No picture. It turns out only the new ID's have pictures. I do not believe that all the faculty members who have pictures or no pictures are insulted in this way.

I expect the people in the community to continue in their usual insensitive way. But does a person have to be insulted within the University community as well?

Carol Cross, PhD
Visiting Assistant Professor-
Biology

Wednesday, January 26, 1977