

Big disappointment

I am extremely disappointed in the Cultural Forum's and the French Departments poor planning to accommodate the crowd of people who wanted to see Eugene Ionesco. Why didn't he appear in a larger facility than the WACO Cinema? Why not the EMU Ballroom?

I have been told that the University doesn't own the kind of projector necessary to show Ionesco's film, and I do appreciate WACO letting us use their theatre, but why not show the film in one place and have Ionesco speak in another, where more people could hear him? The second showing of the movie was of no consolation since it would not be followed by the talk with Ionesco.

There should have been no problem in estimating that the WACO Cinema wouldn't hold enough people, especially considering how much advertising was done. The French, literature, and film classes were specifically notified; there was advertising in the Emerald; and all of the area high schools were invited.

The Cultural Forum, who prides itself on professionally handling such events, did a very unprofessional job. There was no indication in the promotion that seating would be limited to 250. Why were the area high schools invited when it should have been obvious to "professionals" that people would be turned away? It's nice to invite the high schools, but these events should be for the students who pay through incidental fees and for the University community. If there will be room for others without turning away the University community, then fine, invite others. But not unless there is extra room.

I suggest that in the future, if for some obscure reason, a small facility will be used that:

- 1.) reserve tickets should be given away before the show. This would relieve the last-minute problem of not getting in and it would give an indication of interest so that other, satisfactory arrangements could be made.
- 2.) Off-campus groups not be invited unless all of the interested University community can be accommodated.
- 3.) There should be some indication in the promotion of such an event that seating will be limited.

I hope that in the future, better planning will be made to accommodate all who want to see a speaker, especially one of the stature of Mr. Ionesco. It does little good to bring someone like him here unless everyone has a chance to see him.

**Nancy Pubuar
Senior, Journalism**

Indignity

I will be leaving this campus this week and wish to make public some of my experiences with the Emerald and its staff.

I am a South African who is strongly opposed to the South African government and its hideous policy of Apartheid. As such, my sentiments have been of interest to the Emerald and I have twice been interviewed by reporters from that newspaper. In both instances I was prepared to give up several hours of my time (at considerable personal inconvenience, on the second occasion) and went out of my way to arrange a time that was convenient for the reporter.

However, I have also been the coach of the University rugby team during my stay here. On three occasions this term I have sought to publish team results and



"Eat your heart out Travolta!"

news briefs on the progress of the club. In each of these instances my experience of the sports staff of the Emerald has been highly frustrating — to grossly understate the emotion felt! They either made promises that they never kept, or they set up appointments at which they failed to appear. Thursday I rushed through a lunch invitation in order to keep a "promised" appointment with the assistant sports editor, only to find a scribbled note on his desk informing me that he had a class test that time!

The issue here is an important ethical one. It appears that when the Emerald needs the individual it relates to that individual with respect and decency. When, however, the individual seeks the assistance of the Emerald for the occasional publication of club sports

news, that individual is treated as an object of no value. The individual is a nuisance and is subjected to deceit and indignity.

**Ken Dovey
2182 Patterson Str.**

Editor's note: According to Sandy Vaughn, director of the University's Club Sports Program, Emerald coverage of club sports "has been better than ever, and I attribute it to Nick Dawson (Emerald assistant sports editor). He has done an excellent job of finding out what is currently of interest to the students. We have had a good response from Nick in this office."

Lapersontable

The ridiculous personipulation of words by the Emerald is caus-

ing my personibles to tighten. The latest personifestation is the use of the term "Shawoman" in your article of March 7 on psychic healing. I presume your writer presumes that "shaman" comes from a Tungusian stem "sha-" ("healer") and a Tungusian suffix "-man" ("-man," it's remarkable that the Tungusian and the English are identical). I must adapersontly insist that such folk pseudo-etymologies and transformations only serve to bring any movement for consciousness about sex-based content in language into extreme disrepute. I hope the personagement of the paper will take my reipersontd to heart and in the future correct such lapersontstable excesses.

**Robert Ackerson
1789 Columbia, Eugene**

opinion

Another view from the left on Feminism

**Submitted by
Barbara Pope of the
New American movement**

It is important to respond to the opinion written in "celebration" of International Women's Day by Ismet Guchn with Monica Lozano, Cameron Kelly and Cheryl Stroll (GLKS). This article put forth the proposition that the feminist movement "is a new strategy of the capitalist class to direct women away from class struggle." It is important to remind Emerald readers that this is not the only socialist interpretation of the feminist movement. There is another position, the socialist-feminist position. The major difference between GLKS and the socialist-feminist position is that socialist-feminists can distinguish among the issues raised by feminism and analyze their effect on all women. GLKS dismiss feminist issues almost entirely — until after the revolution. We've heard that one before.

A fundamental issue not presented in their article is the fact that male dominance is a system and ideology that preceded capitalism and now has a life of its own. Capitalism, of course, has shaped male dominance "in its own image" and in some important ways — particularly the sexual division of labor — strengthened it. But rape, woman-hating, and the reaction against women's control over their own bodies, cannot be totally explained by a strict class analysis. Such attacks against women's equality and autonomy have existed and still exist outside the capitalist system.

What distinguishes socialist-feminists from many other feminists is our attempt to integrate a sex and economic analysis of women's oppression. We recognize that discrimination and the denigration of women as sex objects are experienced differently by different classes and races. Even violence against women — an abuse that brutally cuts across class and race lines — may be treated differently by our present institutions according to whether a woman is rich or poor, black or white.

Since the integrated analysis is new, socialist-feminists do not have all the ready answers of some traditional Marxists. At this point we are often adding to a feminist analysis by asking Marxist questions. This can be illustrated by looking at two prominent feminist issues —

education and advertising. Feminists have made laudable strides in pointing out and fighting against sexism and racism in public school texts and in attacking sexist and racist behaviors of educators. Feminists have also made clear to the American people how advertising degrades us all. Socialist-feminists agree with the above goals.

We ask, however, not only how racism, sexism and stereotyping can be abolished from the schools, but also: Whom do the schools serve? We recognize and criticize the class nature of education, which produces "liberal" professionals and technicians, on the one hand, and disciplined workers, on the other — and what is worse, perpetuates illiteracy among those who seem "expendable" to the system.

We are not only concerned about the denigrating image of women in advertising (be it the drudge housewife, the sex object or the endlessly cooptable "new free woman"), but we are concerned also about the products advertised. How much does advertising add to the cost of these products? Who labors to produce them? Who profits from their production? Under what conditions are they produced? And — not the least of all — who decides what is going to be produced in the first place? We fully recognize that true democracy means control over our work, over production, as well as control over our personal lives and sexuality.

But we also recognize the deeply radical nature of the feminist demands for the abolition of male privilege and the transformation of familial and intimate life. Although these goals are far from being met, they have already had a great effect on the ideas and practice (both personal and organizational) of many women and some men, and will continue to do so.

Abortion, the demand to control our bodies, is one of the fundamental and potentially radical issues of feminism. We make a clear distinction between birth control (a woman's right to make decisions about her own reproductive capacity) and population control (sterilization or reproduction forced upon women by the state, by a movement, by poverty and ignorance). We actively support the first and fight against the second. We know, too that attacks on women's right to full birth control are often disguised attacks on women's right fully to enjoy and control their own sexuality. Since one of the material

conditions of oppression has been women's inability to control their own bodies, we see the right to birth control and abortion essential preconditions for female equality.

The ERA is an issue of a different order. It is not high on the list of most socialist-feminists' priorities, because we realize that true equality will only come with a change in the economic system. But to fight against it is to miss its symbolic importance within the context of America in the 1970's. The defeat of the ERA will be a defeat of feminism and a victory of the so-called "new Right." As such the ERA (which will bring more rights to both men and women) is worthy of at least minimal support.

Indeed, the Right has not missed the deeply radical nature of many feminist demands. This is why there is a highly financed and growing effort to defeat the ERA and to take away women's right to have an abortion.

On the other hand, many feminists have moved leftward as they realized that they will not gain equality until there are fundamental changes in the economic system. This drift to the left has not yielded the "correct line" or a deep understanding of the Albanian situation, but it is a hopeful sign for socialists, who, to be honest about it, need all the hope we can get. Even the government-sponsored International Women's Year conference came out for full employment and national health insurance.

Why, as GKLS do, join forces with the Right on feminist issues? Our job is to understand the growing conservative attacks on women's rights, and the threatened feelings that provoke these attacks, not to join them. Socialists-feminists know that under a system of alienated labor often the nuclear family is the only place where some workers find personal happiness — or at least think they should find personal happiness. Instead of simply denigrating the family, why not actively support the present progressive alternatives like the rights of gays and women to full economic, political and sexual equality. Alternative lifestyles can help break down the stereotypes of sex roles and "personal happiness." More importantly, socialist-feminists, who are continually concerned with breaking down the distinction between private and public life, must also show that happiness can be gained outside the family — in political, community and cultural organizations, in the real control of work places and production and political life.