

Abortion for poor

In recent months, the U.S. Supreme Court and the Congress have taken measures which will deny the use of Medicaid funds for women wishing to have abortions. The action will create a huge disparity between the rights of wealthy women and poor women in seeking abortions.

The abortion issue is an extremely emotional one. Persuasive arguments can be made on both sides of the theoretical and philosophical debate on the morality of abortion.

But the Congressional and Court decisions dodge the issue completely. Wealthy women will still be able to get abortions, but the poor will be unable to afford them. The poor who cannot afford abortions will seek them in spite of any federal law; granting federal money for abortions merely ensures that the safety of the woman will be protected. This inequity cannot be allowed.

Not many years ago (and even today in some areas), abortions were performed in clandestine meetings with quack doctors or totally uneducated hacks. With low-income women unable to afford abortions, they will return to crude and dangerous methods of abortion. Providing Medicaid money for abortions will ensure that qualified doctors perform the operations in sanitary conditions, a privilege which should be enjoyed by poor as well as wealthy.

Controlling the size of families is a necessity for many low income people. But contraceptive devices are not as readily affordable for poor people, and they are not well educated about their use. Until and unless the government funds education and use of contraceptives, abortion is an option that must be kept open for the poor.

The action by the Court and Congress, supported by President Carter, does not change the government's general policy toward abortion. It merely creates a hurdle to abortions which will be impossible for low-income people to surmount. State and federal policies must apply to rich and poor alike, and if it is necessary to grant federal money to poor people to ensure that goal, then so be it.

Letters

Call of duty

Anyone who saw campus security guard Hal Frey lying on his stomach leaning into an open storm drain two weeks ago across from the EMU may have wondered what was going on — especially since his arm was plunged to the shoulder in the foul-smelling water.

If they had stayed around, they would have seen Frey and Robert Frankel, also of campus security, scooping water and sludge from the deep drain with a pail attached to a long wire handle improvised from a straightened coat hanger.

It was a long, hard, smelly process, but after 30 minutes work they succeeded in retrieving a ring of keys dropped through the drain grating.

After returning the keys to the embarrassed but grateful woman who dropped them, they shrugged off thank-you's and retired to the nearby building for a much needed scrub.

Frey and Frankel maintained a helpful and courteous good humor throughout the incident.

For service considerably above and beyond the call of duty, we would like to publicly thank these two men.

Dorene Klein, Junior CSPA and five co-signers.

Neutron politics

The position taken by the Emerald against the neutron bomb is deserving of the highest praise by those of us concerned about the survival of the human race. However, the editorial is little more than an empty gesture

when put forth isolated from the context of the struggle for detente.

The virtual isolation of U.S. imperialism renders the dominant sectors of finance capital sufficiently desperate to utilize so-called "tactical nuclear weapons" such as the neutron bomb. The victory of the Viet Nameese people signaled the close of Indo-China as a theater for U.S. imperialism, despite recent provocations against North Korea. The victory of the MPLA in Angola heralded the death rattles of U.S. interests in South Africa, Zimbabwe and Namibia. The objective demise of NATO combined with Communist victories in Portugal, Spain, Italy...constitute a mortal threat to U.S. hegemony in Europe — the last outpost of Western imperialism.

However, Jimmy Carter's audaciously hypocritical "human rights" campaign was the final touch in orchestrating the destruction of any viable base for opposition to the neutron bomb. It provides the pretext of morality for a necessary united front in which anti-Sovietism is the central theme. This united front includes forces as broadly based as the most reactionary sectors of finance capital represented in the Tri-Lateral Commission — Jimmy Carter's puppeteers, and social democrats such as Irwin Silber's cliche, Harrington's hoardes, e.g., D.S.O.C., New American Movement, and a Pseudo-Marxist New Left weaned on F.B.I. Story, nurtured by Mission Impossible and enlightened by junior high school curriculum guides authored by that great expert on communism — J. Edgar Hoover. We even find

dominant Maoist elements calling for a strong NATO to contain "Soviet hegemonism, social imperialism" and on the domestic front C.P.U.S.A. "revisionism."

The twin engines of racism and anti-Sovietism have paved the way for the use of the atom bomb from Hiroshima and Nagasaki to the torturous genocide of Soviet atheists by the neutron bomb — a weapon which will leave their precious icons intact to be returned to the U.S. to be worshipped in our churches by "Christian soldiers." These same sentiments could provide the moral rationalization for the use of tactical nuclear weapons such as the neutron bomb against Africans as well as Soviet Communists.

The neutron bomb has raised the stakes of the folly of racism and anti-Sovietism to nothing less than the annihilation of the entire human race.

**Marvin Berlowitz
Visiting Associate Professor of Education**

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. To the extent possible, letters and opinion columns will be printed on a first-come first-served basis. Opinions and letters should be typed with 65 character margins and should be triple-spaced. Letters and columns must be signed and the author's major or faculty status noted.

opinion

Amazon Community Tenants seek recognition

When Amazon Community Tenants (ACT) entered into negotiations with the University on June 28 in an effort to resolve the rent strike, it had essentially two demands: 1) that the administration provide a "system for resident participation in management decisions," and 2) that the administration "provide comfortable housing for families at a low cost." The University has recently rejected both concepts explicitly and in writing, but the fact is that the language quoted above is not taken from ACT documents, but from policy statements published by the Housing office itself.

In veering away from its own stated principles, the administration has embarked on a new course that jeopardizes the existence of low-cost student housing and entails the destruction of the organization that represents Amazon. On July 8, President Boyd sent a letter to Amazon tenants warning that "the holding of state funds involves grave responsibilities" and that "the misuse of state funds carries with it serious legal penalties." Boyd further announced that the University was pursuing an investigation of the "liability of participants in this illegal action." Our attorney, Joe McKeever of Legal Aid Services, has pointed out that "the monies being held by ACT cannot be legally characterized as 'state funds.'" It seems clear that Boyd's letter was intended to intimidate Amazon residents with unsubstantiated charges.

Boyd's letter also stated that the Administration does not "wish to participate in any collaboration with ACT" and that it wishes "to deal with a different group of student spokesmen."

On July 14, Donald Moon Lee, Associate Director of Housing, sent a letter to twelve Amazon tenants announcing that "a special group of Amazon residents, chosen by random numbers from a current list of Amazon residents, has been selected." Each of the twelve recipients of the letter was invited to a meeting on July 19 at 7 p.m. in Carson Hall offices. It is clear that the University wants to be able to break off negotiations with striking tenants while being able to claim that it is earnestly pursuing talks with Amazon residents. Lee and Boyd may be hoping that this "gamble" will pay off by producing a compliant bundle of tenants who will nod "yes" at every suggestion, but it seems more likely that this is intended as window-dressing for the State Board of Higher Education. Whatever happens at the July 19 meeting, the Administration will once again claim that it has demonstrated "good faith."

Labor history buffs may recall that this ploy was frequently used by employers in the years before collective bargaining representation, when such a "chosen" committee was known simply as a "company union." ACT is confident that the University's plan to bypass the tenant union at Amazon by setting up a "company union" will not receive any support here. The only acceptable basis for representation of tenants is through democratic elections to an Amazon board of governance.

At the present time, ACT attorneys are meeting with David Frohnmayer, legal counsel of the University, to discuss alternative approaches to tenant representa-

tion in management structures. Lee's initiative in choosing whom he will meet with from the other side completely undercuts Frohnmayer's efforts to resolve the dispute. If Lee thinks that representatives should be chosen by lottery, he might want to suggest that Frohnmayer's legislative seat be raffled off.

Having rejected the democratic principle that tenants should be able to choose their own representatives, the administration is drifting into dangerous interference with student rights to organize and petition for a response to grievances.

The administration has also made it clear that it is beginning to regard low-cost housing as a bad bargain for itself. In recent years the University has simply dropped its stated commitment to provide low-cost housing to low-income students and now quite openly compares Amazon's "bargain" rates with those on the private market, implying that the differential is embarrassing. As the Haskins and Sells report noted, "It is the policy of the Housing Department not to compare rental rates in the Eugene-Springfield market area with University housing, however, the Director of Married Student Housing often makes such comparisons...." Recently, President Boyd has also taken to comparing Amazon with other housing, arguing in his July 8 letter to ACT that, "by any standard the proposed rates are a bargain for tenants."

This entire approach is inconsistent with the policy of the State Board of Higher Education, which

specified that rental rates shall be the "minimum" required to ensure self-sufficiency and self-liquidation. The administration, however, has twisted state policy to mean that Amazon must subsidize the debt service obligations owing on Westmoreland. The April, 1977, statement on the proposed rent hike even claims that Amazon's failure to contribute its "fair share" to Westmoreland "is one of the reasons why rents must be increased to provide for the required payments on the part of Amazon to the bond debt service." That the idea of Amazon paying a "fair share" of the cost of Westmoreland can be suspected of being completely arbitrary is shown by the various percentages that the Housing Office has considered imposing on Amazon, a range that included zero per cent, 7.75 per cent, 11.65 per cent, 31.40 per cent, and the Haskins and Sells guess of 32 per cent.

The ASUO recently commissioned a review of the Haskins and Sells report by the firm of Gregor, Thorp, McCracken, and Early. Their review concluded that all methods of calculating a percentage are "equally justifiable (or from the other perspective, arbitrary)," and that "allocation of this debt service to Amazon could be interpreted as an attempt to have Amazon residents subsidize Westmoreland rents." Along with Sally Smith, former Assistant Director of Married Student Housing, we "remain unconvinced with the argument that Amazon has a duty to pay a share of the debt service."

If the two projects provided equivalent accommodations and

services, there would be no objection, but it is bordering on the surreal to suggest that a share of the cost of building a modern landscaped building be assigned to other tenants who live in a 30-year-old World War II barracks and who are protesting about inefficient maintenance and neglect.

When talks began on June 28 between ACT and the Housing Office, we felt that a real possibility of working through a process of compromise and agreement existed. When the talks broke down and the Housing Office refused to show up, we offered President Boyd the opportunity to demonstrate his statesmanship by entering into direct talks with ACT aimed at resolving the dispute and quickly ending the rent strike. Instead, Boyd chose to pursue a policy of intimidation and subterfuge.

Boyd has another opportunity to settle the Amazon issue now by investing David Frohnmayer with the authority to reach binding agreements with Amazon Community Tenants. The Housing office should be told to withdraw from their interference in tenant organizations, to stop harassing employees who are in the rent strike, to allow new admissions into Amazon without submitting applicants to a loyalty test, and to provide documents that ACT attorneys have requested. The administration should refrain from inflammatory comment and intimidating letters and let their chief legal counsel sit down and work out the issues with ACT.

**Walt Sheasby
Coordinator for representation
Amazon Community Tenants**

Thursday, July 21, 1977