

Greeks need help

After reading the Emerald editorial on the Public Funding of Social Exclusivity, referring to the Pro-Greek decisions of the Oregon State Legislature and the Incidental Fee Committee, I feel compelled to respond to some of the Emerald's more blatant misconceptions.

I do this in the hope that future "objective journalism" will look farther into a situation than merely asserting a few facts and using them to criticize a favorite whipping boy.

The Emerald's first misconception regards the State Legislature decision to exempt Fraternities and Sororities from paying property taxes. It is the Emerald's mistaken belief that once property taxes were reinstituted last year, all the Greek houses had to do was ask for relief and members of the House "nearly trampled themselves" in rushing to the Greek aid.

This is simply not the case. It was only after several appeal rejections, alumni-faculty meetings, and substantial help by Dean Bowlin that the exemption issue even got to the House floor.

A second misconception was made concerning the legitimacy of Rep. Mary Burrows, R-Eugene, argument that without the property tax exemption many Greek houses would fold.

It was the Emerald's assertion that "even in the unlikely event" that Greek houses did fold it would not adversely effect student housing because cooperative housing arrangements could occupy the current Greek houses.

Again the Emerald is way off base. Several fraternities and sororities have run substantial deficits in the past three or more years and unlike many University-funded groups are unable to ride on the University's cushion. These deficits have all but wiped out any past surpluses acquired in more prosperous years, leaving the Greek houses needing some form of assistance, not taxation.

If an additional tax were put on these Houses they would be forced to close.

These closures would put an even greater burden on the severe housing shortage to which the Emerald made reference. For Greek houses are of a significantly higher density, (more people per square foot of residence) than the "non-exclusive" co-operative housing the Emerald favors.

And finally, the decision of the Incidental Fee Committee to grant a few dollars toward a Greek Visitation day in order to help the Greek system survive was a gracious and non-discriminatory gesture guarantying incoming students another type of housing/lifestyle option. It was not a gross misuse of "public" funds to "channel the predominately WASPish students already headed to college."

By opposing the state Legislature and IFC decisions the Emerald is guilty of not understanding the need for, or problems of, a significant campus minority. This is not to mention advocating a future

housing shortage and a limited freedom of choice in one's lifestyle.

Tim Tofte
Junior, finance

Still no apology

Picture the kissing booth at an old-time county fair, staffed by ladies in organdy raising money for some worthy charity. Undignified? Offensive? Why the judgmental tone? Why not chaste, harmless, comical?

Picture a similar booth in the present, staffed by men and women in jeans and T-shirts raising consciousness. Is this not similarly chaste, harmless and comical — a mild cultural pun? Would it do anyone any good, either, to offer an information campaign on gay rights which shamefacedly held back the only real difference between gays and straights, the difference in whom we each would prefer to kiss?

Now add to the booth the suggestion that homosexuality, like a cold, can be transmitted by a kiss and we see the intended joke in its entirety — a joke on ourselves, if we are lucky, because it illuminates the absurdity of the feeling that there is even as much to be feared here as from the sniffles.

Who could miss such an obvious joke? How could

it ever be any worse than harmless? I know that there were in fact some people who were offended by the GPA kissing booth — they hurled things in the name of Anita Bryant and thereby relinquished any claim to be taken seriously. But I was not offended by it, and I think only someone with an active prejudice would be able to detect any offensiveness in it.

There is one thing, however, that did offend me. It is not only the GPA that Boyd owes an apology to, not only they he has maligned.

Karen Petersen
graduate, philosophy

Spell it out

Re: Jock Hatfield's article on "Confrontation" (Monday, 4/30).

I am not a journalist, but shouldn't initials, acronyms, be used only after the organization has been fully named (at least once)?

I never did find out the meaning of "RCYB" or "ETCYB" (p. 3). Thank heavens I am educated enough to know the meaning of "ASUO" and "EMU", or I'd have really been in trouble.

JoAnne Sloane
University print dept.
101 Allen Hall

theirs



\$5 billion in U.S. arms won't buy Mideast peace

A statement often echoed in the U.S. media and ruling circles after the signing of the Egyptian-Israeli treaty is that "the \$5 billion worth of U.S. military and economic aid to Egypt and Israel is necessary for the continuation of the peace process."

Thus, increasing U.S. military and economic involvement in the Middle East is regarded as a natural contribution to "peace." According to U.S. News and World Report, "The peace treaty is a springboard for a major drive to establish a significant American military presence in the Middle East. The Administration is moving to underpin the security of the entire region, embracing not only Israel and Egypt, but also the oil rich Gulf states."

However, the U.S. involvement in the Middle East is not new. After World War II the U.S. policy the area was structured around two axes. One was the protection of the strategic oil supplies in the Gulf region; the second was the maintenance of the State of Israel to check on forces and the potential developments detrimental to American interests.

The Middle East contains 53 percent of the world's reserves of petroleum, supplies 78 percent of the U.S.'s import needs, and accounts for more than 62 percent of the world's oil exports. The proceeds from oil go to two beneficiaries: the multi-national oil companies and the ruling elites of the producing countries. Remitted profits of the U.S. oil companies from the Middle East came to nearly \$2.5 billion in 1972, or almost one-third of the corresponding figure for all corporations of all industries operating in foreign countries. The rate of return on capital invested in Middle East oil is beyond belief: 167 percent of the book value of the investment. This is why the Senate committee on Energy and Natural Resources came to the conclusion that "... there is at present no substitute for the U.S. presence in the Mid-east oil fields."

It is this background which enables us to understand the statement made by Cyrus Vance, U.S. Secretary of State, that "we consider the territorial integrity and security of Saudi Arabia a matter of fundamental interest of the U.S." It is this background which enables us to understand why last year the U.S. approved \$4.8 billion worth of arms sales to Israel, Egypt and Saudi Arabia and is

proposing \$2.5 billion for the first two this year. This is done in the name of "peace and stability in the Middle East."

The second U.S. goal in the Mid-east is the maintenance of the Zionist state of Israel. U.S. aid to Israel has been enormous. Prior to 1967, Israel received the highest per capita aid from the United States of any country. During the past four years, Israel has received \$10 billion in U.S. aid, more than any other country in the world. This year Israel is to receive nearly half of the total U.S. military aid and 56 percent of the outright grants in addition to the \$1.8 billion worth of arms allocated after signing the Egyptian-Israeli treaty. This relationship became more apparent after the disclosure of "a document of understanding" between the U.S. and Israel last month.

According to the document, the U.S. guaranteed to help protect Israel if the peace pact with Egypt should break down. The document (the defense pact) covers the possible dispatch of American troops and war planes to the Middle East in case of an emergency. Thus, the U.S. has formed an alliance with a racist regime which has been

condemned by the world body. It has put itself in direct confrontation with Palestinian people and their national aspirations.

President Carter could claim that \$5 billion aid to Egypt and Israel is a "contribution to peace" but the American people should know that this money, paid by the working people, is directed against the people of the area. It is further, contribution towards more bloodshed and destruction. The sole beneficiaries of this are: the multi-national oil companies and the ruling classes in the Middle East.

When we see the policy of arming the repressive regimes to the teeth goes side by side with Carter's rhetoric of human rights, we could imagine the type of "peace" that the treaty offers to the people of the area and the American people. It is worthwhile remembering the lesson of Iran: the huge arms sales to the Shah by the United States could not save that repressive regime from the popular revolt. What happened in Iran was not a coincidence!

Committee for a
Free Palestine
Falasteen Horrah

Thursday, May 3, 1979