

Editorial provokes state-employee union defense

I wish to comment on your editorial of Jan. 19. Contrary to your fanciful soothsaying, hospitals will not start kicking welfare patients out of their beds if Atiyeh's proposed cut in the number of paid hospitalization days is passed. They would risk messy media events and jeopardize their federal funds if they kicked the people out.

They will merely write off their losses and use them to justify rate increases just as they do now.

Far more onerous are the governor's proposed elimination of the General Assistance medical program and the ADC/UN non-matchable program. If these cuts are approved, several hundred chronically ill and mostly aged persons will lose all medical assistance and several hundred teenage family units will lose all medical and financial assistance.

You correctly noted that Atiyeh was taking the easy way out by making wholesale program cuts rather than attempting to

make the state bureaucracy more productive. However, you misunderstand the workings of that bureaucracy and in your ignorance you made a stupid and vicious attack on state workers and their union.

You said that reform would be difficult because state employees are protected by a powerful union. In fact only state workers are protected in any way by a union. Supervisors, managers, department heads and the rest who are responsible for designing, implementing and befuddling the programs are not and cannot be in or protected by the union.

The workers through their union have been trying for years to gain some say in how the bureaucracy functions in order to make their jobs more productive and meaningful. If workers had any say in how things ran, we would likely not have situations as presently exist in Adult and Family Services where workers are so bogged down in increasing, voluminous and meaningless

pieces of paper that no worker has been out in the field in over a year to see what the people need or if they even exist.

Management has adamantly maintained that they are solely responsible for all programs and their productivity. The workers and their union are not to blame for the inefficiency of the bureaucracy.

You also said that state workers "have become used to receiving as a matter of course merit-pay increases originally designed for uncommon efforts." In truth, beginning with the first legislative debates on the merit system in 1942, it has been manifestly unclear whether the merit raises were supposed to reward uncommon effort or to reward average work and deny raises only to unproductive turkeys.

In practice, merit raises have been given on both theories alternately through the years depending on the size of the budget appropriation. In 1971 merit raises were even given by pulling names out of a hat in

some agencies.

In fact, since 1975 "merit" raises have through the collective bargaining process become longevity raises. Each state worker who performs adequately is given an annual five percent raise for the first three to five years of his employment.

After that there can be no more raises no matter how extraordinarily he performs in his job. Any state worker can be denied his merit increase by a showing of inadequate performance. This is basically the same longevity pay increase system used in most sections of the economy.

You did state workers a great disservice by stating that they and their union were somehow responsible for the malfunctioning of the bureaucracy and intimating that they received an endless string of raises regardless of how they performed.

Darrel Walker
second year, law

theirs

Texas Chicano 'framed'

On Monday a revolutionary fighter went on trial in Houston, Texas. Eighteen-year-old Edward Gallegos is being framed for attempted murder.

The alleged victim, a TV newsman, suddenly "remembered" it was Ed a full six months after the supposed incident during the Houston Rebellion last May.

Gallegos is being framed because he stood up for and defended the Houston Rebellion. What was this rebellion that it should be defended in the face of such heavy charges?

On May 7, 1978 thousands of Chicano people stood up against the cops, in conscious rebellion. It was a result of the year-long struggle to get justice for Joe Torres, who had been beaten and thrown into a bayou to drown by six Houston cops in May, 1977.

Adding to the outrage, when the killer cops were tried and convicted they got a \$1 fine! So when the cops came into Moody Park during the Cinco de Mays holiday to "do their job" — harass and intimidate — people said, "Get out of here. We don't want your shit anymore."

They kicked their asses and drove them out for the rest of the night; their cars were smashed and burned. They gave the pigs a taste of people's justice, raising the battle cry "Justice for Joe Torres!"

And "Joe Torres Dead, Cops go Free, that's what the Rich call Democracy" was painted on walls. Then the ruling class counterattacked. They arrested over 50 people and singled out three people on charges of felony riot. These three leaders were members of People United to Fight Police Brutality, a group initiated by the Revolutionary Communist Party following the police murder of Joe Torres.

The Moody Park Three were arrested for leading the people, helping them to understand that it wasn't just a few rotten cops that must be fought, but the capitalists that they serve and their system of exploitation that demands and profits from discrimination in housing, education and jobs.

The three were arrested for promoting the examples of the Houston Rebellion, of the people taking things into their own hands and out of the hands of the capitalists, their cops and their courts; and further that this was the only road to getting rid of the systematic oppression of minority people and the working class, once and for all.

As a Chicano, Ed Gallegos faced police harassment and other forms of national oppression everyday. As he took up this stand of "It's Right to Rebel!" and got involved in the struggle to free the Moody Park Three the cops started coming down on him harder than before. After the rebellion had died down, the cops started sweeping the streets and they picked him up, found a book of matches in his pocket and charged him with arson (later changed to disorderly conduct).

Ed went to some People United meetings because of their stand against police brutality. That's when he met the Revolutionary Communist Youth Brigade, which he later joined.

On Oct. 28, after Gallegos had spoken at a rally in Moody Park defending the rebellion and the Three, the vultures in blue swooped down and busted him again, this time on framed-up charges of attempted murder during the May rebellion.

The pigs especially hate this brother because he has become a communist and has refused to bow down to police threats. He told it straight in jail after they found a book on him by Mao Tsetung. The guard asked him, "Why do you believe all this communism nonsense?" He replied, "You murder my people, you harass my brothers and sisters, and then you ask me why we want revolution?"

To all those who hate the pigs and their reign of terror in minority communities; to all those who oppose the systematic oppression minorities face under capitalism; to all



those who hate the system of justice that lets killer cops off with a \$1 fine, while people fighting for justice for Joe Torres face 20-year sentences; we say "Defend the Houston Rebellion!"

Send support letters and defense contributions to People United to Fight Police Brutality, PO Box 87016, Houston, Texas 77087. Write to the Houston District Attorney demanding: Free the Moody Park Three! Stop the frame-up of Ed Gallegos! Drop the Charges Against All Arrested! Justice for Joe Torres!

To hell with their capitalist system of justice; Houston means it's right to rebel!

John Kaiser
for the Revolutionary Communist Youth Brigade

'Is killing half the fun?'

I don't often write letters to the editor. The last was in 1972, I believe. But in the Jan. 17 ODE I saw two letters in interesting juxtaposition that cause me to take up my pen again.

The first basically is a pleading for a rational society, written by Professor McConaughy. His premise was the prostitution of science for medical purposes. I agree that arms have no place in a sane society, especially the weapons we have at our disposal now. We can eliminate life on earth. Can "national security" or "righteous struggle" ever justify this?

It is up to the integrity of the scientists to control and stop the production of these toys. Prof. McConaughy sounds like a pacifist — a term long unpopular with those concerned with righteousness and control rather than right and integrity.

Which brings me to the second letter by Pat Zurcher for the RYCB. He applauds the "wasting of 14 police cars" and the threat of personal harm in Beverly Hills as all part of a "righteous battle" for the "millions of Moslem Iranians."

(Before continuing, lest I be considered right wing, I have a fundamental predilection for anarchism as communism is too conservative. It is concerned with the de-

struction of one conservative order and replacing it with another. But first I am a humanist and pacifist.)

Mr. Zurcher and his band are not concerned with people. If they were they would condemn personal violence. No, they are concerned only with their brand of justice and punishment.

Gandhi showed the capabilities of pacifism, yet they cling to their "armed struggle." Why? Or is killing half the fun, especially when a higher ideal can justify it? These are the people Prof. McConaughy is afraid of — they and their right-wing counterparts who kill rather than sacrifice.

What I propose may well never occur. It is more difficult than pulling a trigger, more demanding than pushing a button. What I propose is that people assume responsibility for who and what they are; that they concern themselves with creation, discovery and a reverence for life; that they answer no call but their own — not some extrinsic Marxist or capitalist ideal, but an intrinsic demand for growth; that they live with integrity and are responsible only for themselves.

If it becomes necessary to die for their convictions, then do so but don't assume the right to extend it to others.

Be honest. How much do you do for others' opinions? Dress. Make-up. Brag. Insult. Party. Spout truisms. Go to school. Date pretty women (or men).

How much do you do for your opinion? There is no higher purpose, no higher call than the one inside oneself.

Bruce Douglass
graduate, physical education

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. Both letters and opinion columns must be typewritten, using 65 character margins, and should be triple-spaced.