



greg wasson

tabled indefinitely

Defenders of American democracy are quick to herald it as the best governmental form available. Frequent elections, almost universal suffrage and the constant threat of the ballot box insure a responsive government.

At least that's what we learned at Corvallis High. Had our education been on the streets of Portland's Albina District, the political framework would likely look less malleable. Lacking the money, status and connections necessary to "communicate" our needs, we would feel locked out of a system that offered many rewards to others, but few to us.

However, I digress.

This piece was prompted by a Portland Oregonian editorial lamenting the black community's use of picketing and a boycott of Lloyd Center to protest the private stands of one of the center's managers. Condemning the boycott as "political bullying" the editorial contends that such tactics destroy free expression. If

public pronouncements produce economic retaliation, goes the argument, owners will be hesitant to participate in public debate. Portland minorities should confine efforts to better themselves to arenas designed to handle such changes.

Perhaps, if this one instance is viewed in a vacuum, a reader could accept the Oregonian's advice. But when considered against the backdrop of the continued, and often unsuccessful, struggle of American Blacks to surmount the barriers of prejudice and discrimination, the paper's counsel must be rejected. Appeals to use the established order come loudest from those who benefit from that establishment. However, when the system becomes a barrier, rather than an aid, plaudits turn to condemnation.

Consider Nixon's Attorney General and all around bad guy John Mitchell. When his trials resulted in acquittal, he praised the wheels of justice for rolling

smoothly. But some ended in conviction, and he complained that the process hadn't worked right.

Understandable, you say? Maybe, but a strong analogy can be drawn between Mitchell's reaction and the Oregonian's advice. One wonders whether the paper would be so quick to urge use of standard channels if the outcome usually went against, rather than for, the white majority.

Closer to home, the same theory is espoused by apologists for the athletic department.

"The increased athletic fee was approved in an open election, so it's justified."

Conveniently ignored is then-University Pres. William Boyd's pre-election comment that it really didn't matter what the students thought.

"If it's the right thing to do, I'll impose the additional fees regardless of the vote."

Say, did you hear that they just had free elections in Chile?

YOURS

Unsound logic

A misshapen piece of logic such as Joe Halluk's letter (Oct. 7) concerning mandatory athletic fees is itself something of an argument against the very position he attempts to explain, viz. he feels that a winning football team is necessary to maintain "high scholastic morale." He expects his readers to sanction a financial tyranny that promises a slow strangulation of intellectual pursuits because the results of that tyranny — gridiron triumphs — will inspire academic triumph! (I suppose we are to cheer with our last breath; scholastic morale without scholars is a good trick.) The logic is a little like that of the American general who declared "we had to destroy the village in order to save it" — or like sending third world famine victims copies of the Wall Street Journal so that rising stock prices will inspire confidence in the production capabilities of America. A connection is there, but it is so badly mangled in its expression that it becomes unrecognizable.

Don't misunderstand me. I am not against college sports, though Halluk's moral character-building rhetoric is too threadbare to convince on its own. However, to label inconsequential the loss of instructors, textbooks, library services, and small class enrollments (in the face of mandatory fee boosts for sports) is seriously to misapprehend the relationship of athletic programs to their parent academic institutions. The "cart-before-the-horse" approach of Mr. Halluk argues for more academic services, not less.

Jim Carson
Graduate, English

Reelect Rust

Although a candidate's stands on the issues are important, just as important are the personal qualities of honesty, intelligence, and experience. Commissioner Jerry Rust lets his stands be known. If he changes his stand because of changed circumstances or new information, he lets that be known.

There are those politicians who try to be all things to all people. In a remarkably short period of time Rust's opponent has managed to accomplish some very contradictory stands. He told striking nurses at a rally that he supported them. Yet two weeks later he said he supported both the hospital administration and the nurses. This is pleasant but meaningless. He tells students that he's a superior environmentalist, yet promises to business groups that he'll ease environmental land-use regulations. He told FISHPAC that he supports a Constitutional amendment to deny reproductive rights to women, while telling the local Women's Political Caucus that he supports the right of choice.

He accuses Rust of worsening relations between the County and local governments, when in fact Rust faces the wrath of his fellow Commissioners because he supports the majority positions of the cities, school districts and public utilities against the go-it-alone, unilateral attitude of the present Commissioners.

Be sure to vote according to the issues. But also remember to vote for honesty, intelligence and experience: reelect Commissioner Jerry Rust.

Dorothy Abelson
2248 Golden Garden
Eugene

OSEA to stay

The Oregon State Employees Association is the bargaining representative for more than one thousand classified staff members of the University. Chapter 338 is the University Local.

Throughout the nation OSEA is regarded as one of the trend-setters in creative Public Employee-Public Management relations. The 1979 contract between OSEA and the State of Oregon was the fourth best gross pay increase negotiated by any state employee union in the entire United States.

Locally Chapter 338 has 15 job representatives, who represent fellow employees in grievances with management. Most of these job reps have received training from the Labor Education Research Center



here at the University, on contract enforcement. They have been so well-trained that they have won several important grievances in recent months, especially in blue-collar areas.

The most recent success was a grievance involving improper notice of a radical change in the custodial shifts at the Physical Plant. All custodians involved will receive a \$21 penalty pay award because their job representative knew the contract and knew how to file a grievance.

We have found that enforcing the contract is almost more important than negotiating it. One of our major goals is to get all department heads and supervisors to at least read the contract and hopefully honor it. Some do, and some don't. Some people consider this harassment — we call it contract enforcement.

Alan Brown
OSEA Membership Secretary

Go, fight, win

I should like to remind the University of Oregon faculty of their proper priorities by means of the following little story, which, though old, is exemplary. It seems that the chemistry department at Ohio State at Inzanesville was called to a special meeting by its chairman, who addressed them thus:

"All right, you people: I have called this meeting to tell you that you are to get going on things! I want to see more research, more publishing, bigger grants, and even better teaching from now on, because

whether you like it or not, we are going to build a chemistry department our football team will be proud of!"

So faculty: Let's go!! Yea Team!!

Edmund Soule
Library Professor Emeritus

Underfunded

Whenever funds are low it is customary to try to use it as an excuse to stop funding programs for minorities — no matter how valuable or frugal the program. Bryan Miller's letter (Oct. 7) is a classic example of scapegoating a minority group for no apparent reason except the "humor value" of closet and fruit-pie jokes. Like all good liberals he quickly adds, "I have some respect for gays, but I think funding should reflect the desires (sic) of the student majority."

The commonly used and accepted figure at which social scientists put gay persons is 10-15 percent of the population. This means that those of us who love people of our same sex are one out of every ten randomly gathered persons. The fact that we have been beaten, fired from jobs, refused housing, treated like monsters and subjected to brutal social myths and lies gives us a very real need to spend time together in situations where support and understanding is available. I would contrast this with the "need" to play ball or the "need" to fund other social "play" for students

on a campus where finding ways and places to "play" is no problem.

The total ASUO programs budget is \$521,000. Of that, the Gay People's Alliance receives .5 percent or \$2,600. If the GPA received the 10 percent it "deserves" based on the number of gay students it would receive 20 times that amount! Of course, gay people also have children in child care, are people of color in the minority student unions, and use other services on campus. Nevertheless, it is clear to me that rather than receiving more than our share, gay people are underfunded based on our representation and our needs. Bryan Miller, you obviously don't know what you are talking about.

Jean Lorraine
1830 Columbia St.
Eugene

letters policy

The Emerald will accept and try to print all letters containing fair comment on ideas and topics of concern or interest to the University community. Letters must be typewritten, using 65-character margins and should be triple spaced.

Letters must be signed, the author's field of study (or faculty status) noted and should include address and phone number where possible.