



greg wasson

## tabled indefinitely

A couple of thoughts on the election:  
 • Progressive government in Lane County ate it Tuesday. Archie survived the recall (he'll likely ignore the large percentage that voted to kick him out and herald his victory as proof that he's doing things right), conservatives won in the East Lane, West Lane and Springfield districts and Jerry Rust started pondering what it will be like to be on the losing end of 4-1 votes.

Those who share my political philosophy of liberalism held wakes throughout the city and mourned the end of an era.

But does it have to be?

The same predicament confronted the liberals of Multnomah County. Their re-

sponse was to restore, by initiative, the system where county commissioners are elected from the county-at-large, rather than specific districts. Lane County had such a scheme till last May when the outlying areas, screaming under-representation, succeeded in establishing the district set-up.

Actually, in the abstract, districts are more fair: they speed control of county government throughout the entire county rather than centralizing it in the metropolitan area. But in Lane County districts will be a drag. Political control now rests with conservatives in the rural and Springfield areas, because the districts were drawn so as to

lump all of Eugene's more liberal votes into a pair of districts.

That switch in the power base bothers the boosters of metropolitan control.

A basic belief underlying liberal politics suggests that most people are too uninformed to make correct decisions. Choker-setters in Springburg and Drain don't understand the value of the Office of Appropriate Technology or departments charged with developing new ways to view the county economy. Consequently, they can't be expected to support candidates strongly behind such programs.

Which leaves those unhappy with the district plan a goal: bring back the old system

or re-draw the districts.

• Government's attitude toward gays has been a major political issue the past few years. It's an issue that lends itself easily to exploitation of misunderstanding and fear.

Two unsuccessful Eugene-area candidates tried to capitalize on that exploitation, but it didn't work.

Jim Pack, Republican challenger in Senate District 22 (most of non-urban Lane County), and Gary Wright, Republican challenger in House District 39 (West Eugene and Santa Clara), tried to hang their opponents with "immoral" approval of the gay lifestyle. It was gutter politics and both Pack and Wright should feel ashamed.

## yours

### Goes behind 'The Front'

I did not enjoy the movie "The Front," shown on campus Oct. 27. I couldn't laugh at Woody Allen's timid jokes or applaud when he finally said "fuck you" to the Committee.

I left the film feeling cheated and angry, and have finally figured out why: it seems to me that making a hero out of the prototype, victimized intellectual reinforces a Jimmy Carter-esque conception of human rights, one that focuses on victims of intellectual persecution but neglects the forgotten victims of repression — in this case the victims of the anti-communist hysteria of the 1950s, popularly known as "The McCarthy Period."

I am referring to the millions of Koreans killed and made homeless in the Korean War (1950-1953), and the hundreds of suspect radicals and leftists driven from the American labor movement in the wake of this war.

"The Front" adds to the establishment view of the '50s as an unfortunate period for artists and intellectuals, while ignoring the reality of the period — the American war against revolution at home and abroad.

Let me explain.

Korea was barely alluded to in the film, by a clip of bombs dropping and a sign reading "38th Parallel." Few viewers picked this up, I am sure.

The Korean War is depicted in the media and in history books as an attack by the "aggressive" North (with the help of "hordes" of Chinese) on a "defenseless" and "free" South Korea.

How many people know that, before the surrender of Japan in 1945, Korea had been a Japanese colony for nearly 50 years? That the Soviet Union occupied the north, that the United States occupied the south because the allies agreed the Koreans were not "fit" for self-rule?

That the U.S. kept the Japanese police force in power, ruled through those Koreans who had benefited from colonial rule, and excluded from power nearly all those who had resisted the Japanese because they leaned towards such radical ideas as land reform? That the Soviet Army withdrew from the North in 1948 and never returned? That a guerrilla war raged through the South from 1945-1950?

That Syngman Rhee, the American-installed President called for an invasion of the North throughout this period, that his party suffered smashing defeat in an election only weeks before the beginning of the war? That General MacArthur badly wanted to invade China, and was strongly backed by the Right-wing in America?

That the U.S. Air Force — at their own admittance — destroyed almost the entire Korean Peninsula in the first six months of the war? That an initial North Korean attack has never been proven, even by the United Nations?

I raise these questions to make a point — that the Korean War is one of the most misunderstood events of modern times, and possibly the crucial event of the so-called McCarthy Period.

Its effects were far-reaching; an anti-communist power base was established in East Asia, the Japanese and American economies were given a shot in the arm with increased military expenditures, and anyone who questioned the ideology behind this was branded a communist and a traitor.

The easiest and most logical target was organized labor. Hundreds of unionists who had fought and organized courageously for the rights of workers and the unemployed were purged for believing that America's wealth should be owned by those who create it with their labor.

Many unionists of foreign origin were deported. All unions were subjected to these witch hunts; only a few managed to resist. Many of the gains made by labor in the 1930s and '40s were erased by the hysteria.

Only later — when anti-communism became a fashionable issue — did the committees turn to entertainment.



In other words, the Korean War created an atmosphere that allowed the repression to take place, and the victim was organized labor.

"The Front" gives an impression of bad guys (The FBI, The Committee) going after the good guys (writers, actors, innocents like Woody Allen). In doing so, it creates a false consciousness of the period.

I do not mean to denigrate the courage of those — Lillian Hellman, Bertold Brecht, Pete Seeger, and others — who stood up to the committees. ("YOU are the un-Americans!" thundered Paul Robeson).

What I criticize is a mentality, symbolized by this film, which extols victims of intellectual persecution while ignoring those who suffer from bombs, bullets, hunger, years of imprisonment, the electric chair (remember the Rosenbergs?).

I criticize a mentality that assumes that American suppression of liberties is a thing of the past. One need only to look at South Korea, Iran, Wounded Knee, or Wilmington to see the falseness of this mentality, and the bankruptcy of Jimmy Carter's human rights policy.

In conclusion, I hope that those who saw "The Front" begin to explore the significance of the 1950s beyond the blacklist, and see it for what it really was: the heyday of counter-revolution in America, when fascism came close to home.

Woody Allen just showed us the tip of the iceberg.

Tim Shorrock  
graduate, Asian Studies & History

### Criticism unfair, they say

The subject of the letter in the Nov. 10 issue of the Emerald, by Russel Kaiser, came as quite a surprise to many of us in the landscape architecture department. In that letter, we were informed that our department was responsible for the accumulation of litter, leaves, overflowing garbage cans, and bicycles in the Lawrence Hall court yard.

Evidently, all you folks outside the School of Architecture and Allied Arts have been maintaining your buildings and sites for some time. All we can say is that nobody told us, we thought that that was the job of the University's maintenance people.

Finally, we think that Mr. Kaiser would be surprised to find that landscape architecture involves more than designing "the landscapes around buildings." Unlike most of the other departments at the University, ours has turned

away from specialization towards an increasingly broadening view of environmental design.

We're not so slow here that it takes five years of education to teach us how to make a pretty place around a building. Anyone who would like to see a few of the things that landscape architects do, is more than welcome to attend our design reviews on the second floor of Lawrence Hall from 8:30 a.m.-11:30 p.m., Dec. 4-8.

Garth Ruffner,  
Doug Graham and  
Steve Sherman  
Third year landscape architecture

### Endorses student access

We commend the Law School faculty's decision to make statistical summaries of student evaluations of professors available to students and challenge the general faculty of the University to show as much concern for quality in education by following their precedent.

The fact that we students contribute to the salaries of the faculty places us in the position of consumers who relate to the faculty as retailers of ideas. As repugnant as the introduction of economic realities into the educational process might seem to those who are mystified into thinking of the University as an ivory tower dedicated to ennobling the species, these realities nonetheless exist. As consumers it is critical for us to be aware of the quality of the products we are sold and student access to the evaluations of faculty members would serve to increase this awareness.

But, as in the monopolistic tendencies of corporate America, where there is an attempt to control and manipulate the consumer into mechanically accepting even inferior products, so in the University are there professors who would attempt to keep students from sharing their critical awareness of the quality of the ideas they are buying. These professors have tried to confuse the issue by claiming that the students are not qualified to evaluate the teaching process and that if students were to have access to the faculty evaluations, the selection of classes would become a "popularity contest." The fact that a professor speaks of the class selection proves becoming a "popularity contest" is revealing, for it first suggests that the professor might be worried about the popularity of his or her own performance, and second that he or she conceives of students as immature and indiscriminating individuals who might degrade a professor in a fit of revenge over being assigned a large amount of work.

Mont Jones  
senior, general literature  
Bob Turner  
senior, english

Tuesday, November 14, 1978