

## A lease is a lease, but rent is rent

The ASUO Off-Campus Housing Office this week is alerting students about rental agreements and leases. Essentially, the warning says "consumer beware," when signing a lease or rental agreement.

The most important difference between 30-day agreements and a lease is that rent cannot be raised by the apartment owner while a lease is in effect. The same protection does not exist for 30-day agreements. If a landlord wishes to raise your rent for your next 30-day agreement, it's legal with 30-days notice.

But over and above the consumer beware notice about leases, students are also concerned about the amount of money they're paying in rent. One classified ad in the Emerald earlier this read like this: "One-bedroom apartment. Short person necessary because of low ceilings." The rent was \$150 per month.

There is a housing shortage in Eugene now; the vacancy rate in housing is about five per cent. That rate is more severe than what the federal government officially terms a housing shortage. Where's the money going?

Well, according to one Eugene landlord, it's not going into the landlord's pockets. He says the housing shortage is here now partly because banks are reluctant to loan money to apartment owners. The reason: money lenders think rents are too low in Eugene to ensure a return on the loan. Banks currently charge nine and three-quarters percent on loans to apartment owners, and that's where a lot of the money goes.

Another bite out of your monthly rent check goes to taxes, according to the landlord. About 17-20 per cent of the revenue gathered from renters goes to various taxes, both state and federal. Other bites are taken out by management, maintenance and advertising.

But to the typical student, this is small consolation for the rent. Currently, the average rent for a one-bedroom apartment is about \$150. The going rate for a two-bedroom apartment is about \$200 per month.

With those rates, a call for rent control sometimes comes up, but usually has no support in political arenas. Land owners claim that with rent controls, they would not be able to maintain apartments and still make a profit. In addition, they argue that rent controls may actually aggravate a shortage.

So the Off-Campus Housing Office's attempt to alert tenants to the intricacies of leases and rent agreements is laudable. In terms of leases and short-term agreements, the market is truly one of "let the buyer beware." But in terms of the amount of rent you pay, it's "let the buyer suffer."

### History clarified

The letter appearing in the January 9, issue of the Emerald contains errors concerning the Villard gift, Villard Hall and the type of institution that the University was prior to 1881, the year of the first Villard gift.

The origin of the University was not religious — in fact, its Charter barred any test for religious beliefs and discrimination because of sex or race. It was from the start a state institution. The curriculum was limited to classical, literary and scientific courses. It did not offer any classes in religion.

Henry Villard gave the University a sum of \$7,000 in 1881 to aid in payment of a debt left over from the construction of the first building on the campus — Deady Hall. Deady Hall was constructed from private funds raised by Eugene and Lane County citizens, however, the funds raised were not sufficient to pay the full cost of construction. In 1881, five years after Deady Hall was opened to students, a number of creditors presented their requests for payment. The faculty, citizens of

Eugene and Lane County initiated a campaign to pay the debt.

Henry Villard, in New York, read of the financial difficulties and offered to pay the debt in a telegram to Judge Matthew P. Deady, President of the Board of Regents for the State University of Oregon. Deady informed Villard as to how much Deady thought was needed and Villard responded with the sum of \$7,000. This was not sufficient to pay the debt in full, but the amount raised locally and the Villard money did satisfy the creditors.

Villard came to the University in the fall of 1881 and immediately stated that he would give the University \$1,000 to aid in laying the foundation for a library, \$1,000 to aid in the purchase of equipment for the physical and chemical department, fund a chair in English literature for one year, and give six \$50 scholarships to the most meritorious students at the University. In 1883 he gave the University \$50,000 in first mortgage bonds on the Northern Pacific Railroad, provided that at least \$400 per year of the interest earned be devoted to the en-

largement of the library.

The State Legislature, in February 1885, gave the University \$30,000 to construct a second building on the campus. This building was completed in 1886 and by a vote of the Board of Regents was named Villard Hall in honor of the first benefactor of the University, Henry Villard.

It was the first building on campus to be named. Deady Hall was referred to as "The Building," "The University," and after the construction of Villard, Deady was called "The Old Building." In March 1893 Judge Deady died and the Board of Regents voted to name the old building in his honor.

Keith Richard  
University Archivist

### Letters policy

The Emerald will accept and try to print all letters and opinion columns containing fair comment on ideas and topics of concern or interest to the University community. Letters and opinions will be run on a first-come first-served basis.



"THAT'S WHAT I SAID! 'WILDLY CHEERING ARAB CROWDS WAVING ISRAELI FLAGS GAVE A TUMULTUOUS WELCOME TO VISITING ISRAELI PEACE DELEGATES HERE TODAY.'... NO, I'M NOT, BOSS... YES, I KNOW I DRINK TOO MUCH... BUT..."

### opinion

## India's Desai should determine his own destiny

Submitted by  
Ozodi Osuji  
Graduate, Political Science

The editorial opinion "India shouldn't touch Tar Baby" (ODE Jan. 6, 1978) appears to be well-meaning. India, a country "where 45 per cent of the population lives in the squalor of poverty and where 50 million people are unemployed" could do better than embark on the expensive luxury of nuclear arms race. It could channel the resources aimed at arms production to agricultural development so as to feed her burgeoning population. All things being equal, of course.

There is a snag, however. All things are never equal. We are living in a world of power politics. The self-proclaimed mighty strive to dominate the weak, and fall into self-righteous rage when their whims and dictates are not obeyed. It is reported that President Carter was irritated and angered by Premier Moraji Desai's rather courageous and adamant insistence that no external authority dictate to India how best to allocate its resources. Undaunted by Desai's surprising assertion of independence, Carter has said that he will send a "cold

and blunt" communique to Desai to encourage him to cooperate with halting the spread of nuclear weapons.

In other words, the President is resolved to influence India's domestic politics. (It must be borne in mind that the Carter-Desai dialogue was not meant for public consumption. It was by accident that a pressman taped this "bullying" session and thus divulged the secret). Perhaps the episode is indicative of the pressure western leaders bring to bear on developing countries' leaders in private, while appearing friendly in public.

The question that suggests itself is: why did the president lose his composure at Desai's insistence on deciding his country's destiny, given that he is the duly elected leader of India and not Carter? One could answer this question in several ways. For instance, the President's belief in humanity is so intense that he couldn't bear to see Desai ignoring the starving masses on the streets of Bombay, New Delhi, etc. while devoting the scarce resources of India to nuclear weapons.

Another possibility is much more subtle and speculative. Could it be

that the President had expected to be listened to, to be obeyed, to be feared? A man does not easily get angry when his equal insists on doing his own thing. Anger is usually provoked when one assumes that the other ought to have done as we desired or lived up to our dictates. Anger betrays an unequal relationship.

Now, psychological speculations aside, has the encounter some political revelations? To be apparently frustrated because another head of state insists on self determination and to threaten to even send him a blunt communique (read, reminding Desai of India's dependency on foreign aid and hence necessity of kowtowing — or else.) is Bismarkian.

While western powers can go ahead and produce nuclear weapons and thus have the whole world at ransom — the nonwestern world must be prevented from doing so. Of course we have the age-old rationalization. They (the world) are too poor, and should face the business of feeding themselves first, that is, if they are rational; otherwise they are "reckless" and unreasonable.

Desai rightly argued "that the US should follow its own rhetoric

in calling for nuclear disarmament before foisting its views on other nations." This is a crucial test of sincerity of intent. Refusal to follow it leaves us with no other alternative but to suspect deceit. However, it could be argued that the US/west have a higher probability of preventing accidents in the nuclear business, given their highly developed technology. Rational? Well, the technological argument could be a specious strategy masking a double standard approach — the idea that some people are more like children and therefore cannot be entrusted with complex responsibilities.

It is worthwhile to observe that while calling on India to give up its nuclear intentions in the spirit of preventing nuclear proliferations, the very apostles of peace and human rights have actually sold and built nuclear plants in South Africa. Yes, the public is given the impression that the South Africans are engaging in that venture by themselves. Actually, it does not take much thinking to realize that the international corporations making astronomical profits via cheap African labor have prevailed on the western powers to

build nuclear weapons in South Africa as a means of safeguarding their economic interests. The rising demand for equal political participation by all the peoples of South Africa, they figure, must be dampened by the threat of nuclear annihilation.

In conclusion, it is my view that as long as some human beings wield weapons, the rest of us are neither truly free nor safe. Control of the means of coercion has always been the most effective means of dictating obedience domestically or in foreign relations. Depending on the "good intentions" of the armed man to safeguard our lives, is a misguided illusion. True independence for India, or for that matter any third world country, is to possess those means of force which can enable them to protect their territory and sovereignty from external arrogant interventions. Cost is irrelevant when national survival is at stake.

A better but less feasible alternative is complete disarmament. In the meantime, Moraji Desai has as much right as any to engage in the race for mutual self-destruction.