

## Press freedom threatened

The U.S. Department of Justice, casting doubt upon its very title, Tuesday filed an Amicus curiae, or "friend of the court" brief, with the U.S. Supreme Court asking that more power be given to police agencies — specifically, that they be given the power to search newspaper offices for evidence in criminal cases.

The case came to the U.S. Supreme Court from that paragon of the American system of government and freedom — California. The case stems from a police raid of the offices of the Stanford University newspaper, the Stanford Daily. Early in 1971, some police officers were injured during a student demonstration in the administration offices of the local hospital. The police apparently decided to take the law into their own hands and unexpectedly raided the newspaper offices looking for photographs they could use to identify the demonstrators. The police searched the paper's photo laboratory, file cabinets, desks and waste baskets, but couldn't find anything they could use.

A federal judge ruled the search unconstitutional because the police had not attempted to get a subpoena for the material they wanted. The police apparently bypassed the subpoena because of a Stanford Daily policy of destroying evidence in the event of demonstrations — a policy the paper used to guarantee anonymity to news sources.

The Justice Department is now supporting the District Attorney of San Mateo County and the Palo Alto police in seeking the power for police to enter newspaper offices armed only with a search warrant. That would, if the court supports the position, give police agencies all over the nation the right to raid any newspaper office. That is a power that verges on police-state tactics and it is perhaps the most flagrant attempted rape of the First Amendment to come along in years. We're surprised the Supreme Court even agreed to hear the case, and we're still further surprised the

Justice Department would support such pernicious powers. We hope the court intends to hear the case in order to bury requests like this one forever.

In recent struggles for press freedom, newspapermen have in some cases gone to jail for refusing to reveal confidential sources of information. If confidential sources are revealed, information is buried because sources will never tell reporters anything that may damage themselves. These cases have led to the idea of "shield laws," under which a reporter may withhold the names of news sources. Oregon has such a law. But the Stanford Daily case takes the argument away from the newspapers and the courts and gives it to the police, subverting the court process and giving the police the power to take what the reporters and editors have refused to give to the courts.

If a newspaper reporter is subpoenaed, he can go to court to argue against the reason for that subpoena. If the reporter's newspaper is searched by the police, however, the reporter and the editors have nothing to say about it.

Newspapers have been arguing that the relationship between reporters and their sources of information is similar to the relationships between doctors and their patients. Opponents to this view argue that the police should be able to get information from newspapers the same way they can obtain information from anyone else. But if police can raid newspaper offices at any time with only a search warrant, sources of information about pressing social issues will never surface, and neither will the issues.

If the First Amendment is worth anything more than the paper it's written on, the Supreme Court should rule against the police. And the Justice Department, supposedly the most responsible justice agency in the nation, should call off its dogs lest they trample that cherished document into the ground.

## Pay the wage

The University has apparently decided not to comply with the new minimum wage, which brought the wage up from its 1977 level of \$2.30 per hour to the current \$2.65 per hour. Because of a Supreme Court ruling of 1976, the University is not bound to pay more than 85 percent of the prevailing minimum wage, but an administration policy statement of August 1977 states that the University will comply with the minimum wage. Since the policy has not officially been changed, the University is violating its own guidelines.

Apparently, the University wasn't expecting the wage to be raised as much as it was. The minimum for this year is not substantially over what the University now pays students, but the administration is keeping a wary eye on the future. The wage is scheduled to increase to \$3.35 by January of 1981. The administration feels that raise could bite a substantial amount of money out of its operating expenses.

The University has been more than fair in its pay scales for student workers in the past. As of 1977, virtually every student employee was paid a wage well over the minimum. Of the nine positions now under the minimum wage, all of them were above the old minimum. Many of the nine positions were close to the new minimum wage, and the lowest pay was \$2.40 per hour. The University is to be congratulated for its fairness.

However, the University should comply with the new minimum wage scale. Students are hard-pressed by inflation in the same way other workers are, and should be paid what the federal government believes is a fair minimum. We applaud the University's position of paying a good wage to students, but we think it should follow through with that policy.

According to University Personnel Director Jack Steward, the number of students involved in the below-minimum wage scale is not now known; nor is the financial impact of raising those nine positions to the minimum. Steward says the number is probably small, but he hesitates to set a figure before a controller's report of the exact numbers is released. That report is expected to be completed within the next few days.

Since the number of students is relatively small, and the wages they now receive are not far below the new minimum wage, the conclusion is that the financial impact of the raise this year would not be vast. The minimum should be paid this year.

The University is understandably wary about the future increases. But the financial picture for the University for the next three years may be affected by a number of sources. For example, enrollment figures probably can't be projected that far into the future, and money sources such as the State Legislature may be sympathetic to the University in responding to the minimum wage. These variables are now uncertain, so the University would be well advised to study the minimum wage for students next year, when the financial impacts are virtually guaranteed to be greater.

Steward explains that students will receive pay raises to the tune of four percent in April and five percent in December. But just about the time those raises take effect, the minimum wage will jump again. Steward says the University will look once again at its policy in April to decide whether or not the minimum wage should be met.

But we think the University should study the controller's report when it comes out soon. Since the financial impact of raising the nine positions to the minimum wage would not be out of the world, the wage should be met, and the University should abide by its August policy statement.

## State Board stalling

Submitted by  
Pat Zurcher for the  
South Africa Liberation Support Committee

The State Board of Higher Education is trying to take back the victory won by Oregon students last term in getting rid of stocks in Southern Africa!

Their foot-dragging and "legal" maneuvering is an outrage! The issue is clear — whether to support South African apartheid or oppose it. While the Board stalls for time, the rising struggle of the peoples of Southern Africa continues to face bloody repression. We must support the peoples of Southern Africa now! It's clear that it wasn't enough to force the Board to agree to dump the stock. We've got to continue the fight until the stock is actually dropped — and beyond.

There will be a demonstration on Wednesday, Jan. 25, at 12:30 p.m. to demand: "State Board — No More Stalling! Sell the Stock NOW!" Oppose the stalling of the Board on this issue and stop it from being swept under the rug — attend the demonstration! It is important to have a militant action at this time to aim our anger squarely at the Board because it meets two days later on Friday, Jan. 27, in Monmouth. Come to the Jan. 27 meeting to demand divestment now (carpools to Monmouth will leave from the EMU Terrace).

The Board actively opposed divestiture right from the start — and only voted to divest when over 200 students put them up against the wall at their Nov. 18 meeting. Cornered, they voted to sell the stocks. But almost as soon as the decision was made Attorney General Redden suddenly "discovered" it might be "illegal" and — seeing a way out of the vote — the Board decided to halt the divestiture before it got started. At their Dec. 16 meeting in Portland they made it formal — voting to put the divestiture on ice while Redden seeks a way to get out of it altogether.

Why didn't the Board mention this matter of

"legality" before or even when they voted? That's a good question — since they admitted at the Dec. 16 meeting that they'd known about it all along. The fact is that the Board gives lots of investment instructions and guidelines to its investment counselors, and no one questions them. It was only when the issue of South African investments came up that this problem was suddenly "discovered."

Why doesn't the Board go ahead and divest and then see if anyone challenges the legality of the action? Also a good question! When they vote to raise tuition they don't wait around to see if anyone will question their action before socking it to us.

Once again these representatives of bankers and rich businessmen on the Board are showing us that they oppose the interests of the people of Oregon and Southern Africa. They've made it clear that it's up to us to carry this fight through!

Events in Southern Africa are rapidly reaching the boiling point. Popular leader Steven Biko is beaten to death by the police and his murderers are cleared by an investigation by the racist government. Thousands defy police to attend his funeral. Little news filters out about resistance from South African blacks, but the growing level of repression by the Vorster government has exposed the increasing desperation of its position.

In Zimbabwe (Rhodesia) the liberation forces already control large sections of the countryside. These events in Southern Africa are bringing more and more people into the struggle here against U.S. involvement in Southern Africa.

It's clear we have a long way to go with the divestiture fight and a lot more to do to really build support for South African liberation. This involves many things — working to stop sales of the Kruggerand, educating broad numbers of students about what's really coming down there, and building a movement that can counter any attempts of the U.S. government and corporations to perpetuate enslavement in South Africa.

