

President botches kissing booth criticism

The University's estimable and usually articulate Pres. William Boyd has stumbled into a minor controversy involving a kissing booth in the EMU.

Earlier this week he told a local television reporter that if he (Boyd) were a student, he'd be irritated that his money was funding the booth, which is sponsored by the Gay People's Alliance as part of Gay Pride Week.

The president went on to say he found the booth "undignified and offensive" and a device that might repel potential supporters of gay rights rather than raise public consciousness, as the GPA intended. Boyd added that he finds heterosexual kissing booths, which GPA leaders say their booth is satirizing, to be merely "silly."

Boyd erred in assuming student funds financed the booth, a flaw in his observations that he dismissed as a "technicality." Such an oversight certainly seems excusable, though not praiseworthy in one who usually evinces measured and well-considered opinions.

OURS

In fact, in recent weeks the University president has been astutely on target in such matters as the proposed (and apparently discarded) increase in foreign graduate students' tuition and the fumbles of city officials and architects involved in the Eugene arts center (for which Boyd is an advisory board member).

But he has accomplished a less admirable exercise in relation to the GPA booth by swathing social intolerance in the thin raiment of a commentary on political tactics.

"If the purpose is to raise the public's awareness to treat gay people with dignity, then they shouldn't do something that is undignified," he says.

His apparent concern about creating an adverse reaction among heterosexuals toward gay rights seems an attempt to foist off on an unspecified "public." Boyd's own dislike of the concrete manifestations of gayness (which is, after all, essentially a sexual definition).

In this, he is rather like the client at a public health department seeking information on sexually related topics for a "friend."

At a Wednesday-night panel discussion on the difficulties of being gay in a hostile, heterosexual society, one speaker noted that while some persons "accept" homosexuality intellectually, they reject the physical reality of it in daily life.

Like these persons, Boyd's abstract liberality does not extend to the incarnate world and so, finally, becomes no more than a passive form of the egg-throwing and jeering that have beset the booth's participants.

Regarding the exigencies of revolution someone once suggested that you can't make an omelette without breaking eggs; to which we would add, you can't raise people's consciousness by disappearing back into a closet.

YOURS

Campaign 'dreams'

Kevin Chambers' dreams that "this entire campaign would be fair and up-front" were shattered long before Amy's haphazard allegations.

Scott held a free-beer rally before the primary election which would have put him dangerously close to the \$125 spending limit — had he decided to declare it on his expense form. He didn't; although the posters announcing it were all over Carson Hall (and listed on the expense form). Scott said that the rally was a Cloran Dorm function and part of his "personal life."

Hmmm.

An article in the dorm residents' newspaper last week detailed what was "needed" in an ASUO President. The article happened to fit in quite nicely with Scott's campaign. And why not? It was written by Clark Harris, who, though few people would know it, is heavily involved in Scott's campaign.

Hmmm.

A blue VW bus appeared at the corner of 13th and University last week, laden with Bassett window posters, and parked across the street from a voting booth. Mike Lockwood, who is in charge of elections, had to order the Bassett campaign to remove a poster from the window facing the booth because it might have unduly influenced voting.

Hmmm.

Well, Kevin, I won't go as far as to say that all of this is "in bad taste."

That's the voters' job.

Mike Lee
sophomore, journalism

Appalling charges

I am appalled at the charges made by Miss Amy Tobias against Scott Bassett, both candidates in the ASUO Presidential election. To accuse Mr. Bassett of swinging his votes in IFC hearings for presidential ambitions is serious; to do so without specifics or substantiation calls into question the integrity of Miss Tobias herself.

I openly challenge Miss Tobias to come to the Incidental

Fee Committee office in Suite 5, EMU and point out specific instances of vote swinging. I challenge Miss Tobias to substantiate the charges that she has made due to presidential ambition.

Until that occurs I urge all to carefully consider the situation and draw a distinct line between clear fact and unsubstantiated allegation.

Janet Eggleston, chairman
Incidental Fee Committee

Offer alternatives

The problems of nuclear generators stem from human ignorance of much of nuclear and atomic physics, not from the absolute unworkability of the plants. Nuclear power may be so dangerous that humans should not yet try to use it, and alternative energy sources will have to be developed anyway. But the only way these facts can be dealt with is through education.

The failure of any nuclear reactor is a tragedy, and people should be concerned with making sure that such a tragedy does not happen again. Yet instead of educating themselves in the nature of the failure and its preventives (shutdown or otherwise), too many people are satisfied with smiling and waving signs at cameras. Some are apparently not even concerned with the manner in which a plant is shut down, or whether a decommissioned reactor would be properly disposed of.

It is true that protestors alert citizens and congressmen to things. But if all the energy that goes into demonstrations were behind a program to develop a specific, feasible alternative power plant, then not only could people be altered to the need for it, but the solution to the problem of nuclear power could be had.

Meanwhile, those of us with our lights on and our tongues flapping had better not pat ourselves too firmly on the back when someone else comes up a safer nuclear plant, or the much needed alternative.

Russell Ward
senior, physics



Kokis supporter

April 9 my wife and I drove from Corvallis to Eugene for a doctors appointment and then we planned on going shopping at Valley River Center. We discovered that Cynthia Kokis was in jail as a result of Valley River officials having her arrested for her support of the Nestle Boycott. She had a table at Valley River Center in the context of the International Year of the Child display. Kathy and I decided that if Valley River wanted their property to be "private," we would let them have it so, and we'd go to the city jail and demonstrate on behalf of Cynthia and the cause of the Nestle Boycott. There are other times and places to go shopping.

Rev. John Conner
101 N.W. 23rd St.
Corvallis

Property first

It is interesting to see someone who obviously knows little about the meaning of Man's rights writing a column entitled Political Rhetoric, especially when he condemns "property rights" and upholds "free speech" as if somehow

they were in conflict. To quote Ayn Rand, "The right to life is the source of all rights — and the right to property is their only implementation. Without property rights, no other rights are possible. Since man has to sustain his life by his own effort, the man who has no right to the product of his effort has no means to sustain his life. The man who produces while others dispose of his product, is a slave." (Virtue of Selfishness, page 94) ... How free is a man with no right to life? How free is a man whose products are expropriated, but can talk all he wants? The only freedom he has is to starve.

Once one accepts the right to life, hence the right to the product of one's effort, hence the right to property, then one can have other rights.

Freedom in a political context has one and only one meaning: freedom from coercion. A government's only purpose in a free society, then, is to protect the individual from coercion. Free speech means that one has the right to speak. It does not mean that someone else must provide you with a microphone or a soap box, not that other people will want to listen: it only means that one is free from coercion when one

speaks providing one is not coercing someone else, such as violating his right to property.

Ms. Kokis, who has trespassed at Valley River, was violating the owners' wishes on their property, which is coercion of his right to property. I wonder how Mr. Harden would feel if the Nazi Party set up a booth in his living room. Would he still uphold "free speech vs. property rights?" Neither the amount of property nor the owner's designation of its use negates the principle of the right to life. If a person has more ability than another and profits more than another because of his ability, he is entitled to the same right to life. Only when an owner violates someone else's rights via coercion is this not true; such as taking a gun he owns and using it to expropriate money from someone else. But the use of one's property in a noncoercive manner is an inalienable right of all free men.

I suggest Mr. Harden (or any other interested person) read Ayn Rand's The Virtue of Selfishness if he wishes to understand of what he speaks.

Bruce Douglass
graduate, physical education
Friday, April 27 1979