

Rent-control idea could use student boost

Too much awful's happening to write about: students getting connived out of a peek at course evaluations due to political gimcrackery, the State Board of (allegedly) Higher Education trying to dump the cost of administrative inefficiency on tuition-payers, the proposed moratorium on nuclear power plants suffering an abbreviated half-life.

We leave (at least temporarily) such matters to those foremost in the trenches. Instead, let's take a look at something students can do to bring lower rents (or a reduced rate of home-cost inflation) into the world.

Mike Shelly has proposed amend-

ing the Eugene city charter to establish a system of rent controls, limit rental deposits and create a "rent stabilization commission."

Shelly, whose job locating emergency shelter for low-income families makes him something of a permanent house-hunter, wants to

ours

make it easier and less costly for lower-income persons, including some students, to find adequate rental housing.

His preliminary petition for the project now lies in the city attorney's office awaiting judgement on the

legal format of the proposal. If it passes that scrutiny, the petition will be assigned a ballot title and Shelly will have 100 days in which to collect the 6,227 signatures needed to put proposed amendment on the November ballot.

Eugene badly needs the kind of controls on rental practices that Shelly is suggesting: a ceiling on deposits and fees of three-fourths the monthly rent, a requirement that all fees and deposits be refundable, and freezing of rental rates at 110 percent of that charged on Feb 1, 1979.

Higher building costs have slowed the rate of new construction while increasing population places ever-greater pres-

sure on would-be renters.

The supply-demand dynamics that have forced rents skyward, however, do not necessarily reflect increasing costs to landlords but only the opportunities of a "seller's market." Shelly's proposal seems a fair and potentially effective response to this situation.

The ASUO's Off-Campus Housing Office has indicated its support of his project, Shelly says, and an interest in helping circulate petitions for the charter proposal. Individuals desiring to help can contact that office, EMU Suite 3, or Shelly himself, 689-7156.

yours

Rather limited

In response to Dianne Blake's letter of May 18, I feel I must clear up several misconceptions. Regarding the reference to "The Yearbook of Spoken Opinion," I would like to remind Miss Blake that the statements in this book are, as the title clearly reflects, merely opinion. Also, political leaders cannot speak freely; they are limited to political rhetoric in order to preserve their own political position.

Material of this type can hardly be considered a clear analysis of any situation. If Miss Blake's "extensive research" has been based on this type of limited information, her viewpoint must be recognized as extremely limited.

Referring to the analogy of the Israeli formation of a state being compared to the formation of a state in the U.S. for the Vietnamese Boat People, the attempt to draw a parallel lacks so much background as to be nearly invalid. First, the Jewish People were the original, Biblical inhabitants of the area that is now Israel. The Vietnamese refugees have no such claim in the U.S.

Second, much of the land in America is privately owned, meaning the inhabitants of the area involved would be removed from their own land. In the formation of Israel, the situation was much different.

According to British Government statistics, (Survey of Palestine, 1946, British Mandate Government, Page 257), prior to the establishment of the state of Israel, 8.6 percent of the land was owned by Jews, 3.3 percent of the land that is now Israel was owned by Arabs, and 16.5 percent of the land was owned by people not living in the area.

More than 70 percent of the land was owned by the British Government and was passed to Israel when the United Nations passed the partition resolution. Only a tiny fraction of the land in the partition was privately owned, and the inhabitants of those areas were urged to stay.

In a very dramatic way, Miss Blake claimed the Israeli Arabs were denied the "right to live and work as equals..." (and) are denied the choice of who their own leader is." The U.S. State Department publication,

"County Reports on Human Rights, 1978," reported that the average per capita income among Israeli Arabs is higher than in almost all of the surrounding countries.

Israel's 470,000 Arabs are allowed to vote as freely as any Jewish citizen. The Israeli Parliament contains five Arab representatives. Can any of Israel's sworn enemies claim they treat Jewish citizens that well? The answer, Miss Blake, is no.

When the United Nations created Israel, they also created an Arab state in the same area.

The two states were to be separate, yet economically dependent upon one another. Arabs and Jews were to live peacefully together. This workable proposal was shattered by five Arab nations in a united declaration of war on Israel.

Azzam Pasha, secretary general of the Arab League, expressed the Arab view on May 15, 1947. "This will be a war of extermination and a momentous massacre which will be spoken of like the Mongolian massacres and the Crusades."

Who was fighting for their lives Dianne, the Arabs, with the armed might of five Arab nations behind them, or the handful of poorly armed Israeli's?

The most inappropriate statement in Miss Blake's letter is the comparison of Hitler's Holocaust to the situation of the Palestinian people. To compare the planned murder of the Nazi death camps to the Palestinian situation is to reduce the genocide of six million men, women and children to an almost commonplace event.

Speaking for the concentration camp survivors I know, how dare you, Miss Blake, reduce the agony and suffering of millions in your cold, almost audacious way to mere "intolerable" treatment. None of us can really know the horrors of those camps, and to play them down is a crime.

So, Miss Blake, don't classify the American outlook on the Middle East as myopic, for your own outlook is rather limited. My advice to you, and to anyone interested in the Middle East situation, is to research both sides of the story before you make a final judgment.

Barak Tanzer
freshman, undeclared



Need criteria

As a taxpayer, faculty member and graduate student, I am concerned about the apparent lack of specific criteria regarding allocations from the University's budget for classes in the various professional schools and academic departments. Such guidelines (based partially on number of majors and credit hour totals) would insure that money is being spent in accordance with student demand.

Any statistical evaluations based on credit hours would, of course, have to take into consideration the nature of each individual course (graduate seminar, lower division lecture survey, performance group, etc.).

In the absence of guidelines, too many arbitrary and subjective judgements may be made — with the potential for politically based harassment or even job termination of "controversial" untenured faculty members, particularly those who have been critical of the administration's policies in the area of academic planning. Stricter guidelines might also eliminate some of the constant interdepartmental backbiting and infighting so common at the University — most of which is centered on competition for funding.

The University of Oregon is a public institution, supported mainly by taxes and tuition. The public has made repeated calls

for better economic planning based on sound and proven principles of fiscal management — at all levels of government. Certainly the University could be run in a more business-like manner. The concept of supply and demand should not be considered undignified.

Paul Halpern
instructor/graduate student

'Itching ears'

As a Christian I feel the need to be distinguished from Rev. David Pelletier, Pastor of the Metropolitan Community Church. In explaining discrepancies between his church's stand concerning homosexuality and those of Bible-believing Christian churches, he says his church is "a scripturally centered church, not a biblicist church. The Bible is not our God."

Pelletier undercuts the authority of the Bible in order to give himself the freedom to choose what to believe and what to reject. If the Bible is from God, everything in it is true. (It is ludicrous to think that the God who created the universe could not keep His Word from being altered or lost over time.) Whether or not one chooses to believe it does not change its truth.

Nor is it a matter of interpretation. The Bible is clear on the issue of homosexuality. "Do not lie with a man as one lies with a woman; that is detestable." (Leviticus 18:22) Is there

another way to interpret that?

Or how about this one: "The men also abandoned natural relationships with women and were inflamed with lust for one another. Men committed indecent acts with other men..." (Romans 1:27).

Pelletier and members of his "scripturally centered" church obviously do not center on those passages of Scripture! They are hypocrites of the worst kind.

The Bible sums up their condition better than I could when it says, "For the time will come when men will not put up with sound doctrine. Instead to suit their own desires, they will gather around them a great number of teachers to say what their itching ears want to hear. They will turn their ears away from the truth and turn aside to myths." (II Timothy 4:3,4)

Nick Wilson
junior, landscape architecture

'Telling reply'

Considering the various responses to my letter of May 15 ("Infinite Dismay"), I think the most telling reply I can make to their authors is this; they have no sense of humor. My letter was as much a parody of the typical sort of anti-Greek piece found in the pages of the Emerald as it was on the tender sensibilities of the Greek community.

Richard Kaminiski
senior, history
Friday, May 25, 1979

theirs