

For jazz that is
'uncommonly good,'
See Page 7

Monday, May 13, 1985

Eugene, Oregon

Volume 86, Number 152



Protesters brave rain at anti-apartheid rally

By Scott McFetridge
Of the Emerald

It was rain instead of police that confronted South African apartheid protesters during a two-hour rally on the Capitol's steps in Salem on Friday morning.

About 175 people, most of whom were from the University, braved the frequent showers that accompanied the speakers and shouted their approval for divestment of state funds in companies doing business in South Africa.

"We're not afraid of the rain, we're afraid of injustice in South Africa," said Costas Christ, the opening speaker of the rally. "President Ronald Reagan calls the South African government a friend and ally of the United States, but they don't deserve the friendship of our country or our support."

Christ's statements were echoed by Rep. Margaret Carter, D-Portland. There are 26 million blacks and mixed "colored," mostly of Asian descent, who are being denied civil rights in South Africa, Carter said.

"Can Oregon do anything alone? No," she said. "You are part of the vanguard for a people with no voice."

Carter is the chief sponsor of House Bill 2001, which would force divestment of state funds connected to South Africa. An amended version of the bill was approved by the House Human Resources Committee on Friday.

Reps. Ron Eachus, D-Eugene, Mike Burton, D-Portland and Jim Hill, D-Salem also spoke at the rally.

The state should invest in Oregon instead of in "crimes against humanity," Eachus said.

American companies operating in South Africa won't cause any changes in the racial segregation policies, Eachus said. But the threat of divestment will force the South African government to abandon apartheid, he said.

The struggle to end apartheid comes down to a personal conviction that "none of my money is going to go to South Africa," Eachus said. Divestment of state funds is prudent, and state revenue will not be endangered by it, he said.

"With your support we're going to bring this up every year until we get it (a divestment bill) passed," Eachus said.

Burton said he believes the Legislature will approve the divestment bill during the current session, but the struggle to end apartheid must continue even if the bill is not passed.

"We need to stick with it and keep at it," Burton said.

Photo by Andrea Skufca

Divestment bill sent to House

By Paul Ertelt
Of the Emerald

SALEM — A House committee on Friday approved a compromise divestment bill, sending it to the floor of the House.

House Bill 2001-15, an amended version of a bill intended to divest state funds invested in companies doing business in South Africa, was approved by the Human Services Committee 5-4.

The bill directs the state treasurer, in consultation with the Oregon Investment Council, to divest stock in companies doing business in South Africa that are not following the expanded Sullivan Principles, which are voluntary anti-discrimination standards.

The original bill called for complete divestment over a two-year period, but Rep. Margaret Carter, D-Portland, a committee member and sponsor of the bill, said the original bill had little chance of passing.

"This was a real compromise for me... but it is better to have something than to have nothing," she said. "If we had not had accepted this, we would have nothing."

Carter, 13 other representatives, and four senators sponsored the bill at the request of the ASUO, the University's Black Student Union and others. The bill would affect \$300 million of state investments from the Public Employees Retirement Fund, the Industrial Accident Fund, the Common School Fund, the Oregon War Veteran's

Fund, and other funds in the custody of the state treasurer.

In the first phase of the bill's divestment schedule, which must be completed by June 30, 1987, the treasurer and the OIC would be required to remove deposits from banks that make loans to the South African government or South African companies. Also, all stocks and bonds in South African companies would be divested.

During the second phase, which must be completed by June 30, 1990, the state treasurer and the OIC must divest stocks and bonds in U.S. and international companies doing business in South Africa, unless those companies are following the Sullivan Principles.

"We started out with a measure in which we wanted to make a social statement, and I think we are doing this," said committee member Rep. Shirley Gold, D-Portland.

But the measure was harshly criticized by Republican members of the committee, who argued that divestment will hurt the return on the affected funds.

Carter responded to that criticism by reading a letter from a New York stock broker who said portfolios free of South African investments performed as well as non-divested portfolios.

The proposed measure stipulates that divestment must be in accordance with the state's pr-

Continued on Page 10

Playboy photographer shares views on art and pornography

By Michael Duncan
Of the Emerald

When the camera focused on the first playmate in 1954, an image was captured that placed Playboy magazine in the center of a controversy. Founder Hugh Hefner hailed his magazine as promoting the liberation of women, while journalist Gloria Steinem has worked to dispel the "happy bunny" myth.

The Playboy controversy came to campus Friday with the arrival of veteran Playboy photographer David Chan, who is in Eugene to recruit female University students for the "Girls of the Pac-10" pictorial essay, pegged for publication in October.

A graduate of the Brooks Institute who is regarded as one of the master portrait photographers in the country, Chan has for almost 20 years shaped and molded the images of his models and the very image of the magazine itself.

In a motel room temporarily decorated with college pennants, the Emerald turned the camera and focused on the controversial, yet candid, Chan.

EMERALD: How do you view your medium?

CHAN: Keats sums it up: beauty is truth and truth is beauty. When I photograph something, something that is beautiful, I try to photograph it as it is; it has its own truth. It is my goal to capture an image as beautifully as is the subject. The result is my art. The playmate is the ultimate in beauty.

But some people don't see things this way; 10 people viewing the same photograph will look at it 10 different ways

and have 10 different reactions. Some will see it as art, others as pornography.

EMERALD: Once a model is contracted, is the set tailored to the model or the model to the set?

CHAN: It can work both ways. We start out with the lady next door, and today's young ladies are no longer naive, insecure ladies like they may have been 10 years back. Today is entirely



David Chan

different. They want to go out in the world and make it on their own. They don't need a man to support them, especially in the college level.

Usually the set does not have to be tailored to the model. The models, for the most part, are young and haven't really developed characteristics that restrict the casting of an image. And in the centerfold photograph we usually try to make them fit into a fantasy; they are tailored to our idea of an impression or image. But

with the picture story showing her lifestyle, we bring her back to reality, who she really is.

EMERALD: Does the magazine respond to what it perceives as readers' tastes in sets and women, or does Playboy create what readers like?

CHAN: Both and neither. We always try to put them on a higher plane than what they are, we try to make them look as beautiful, exotic and erotic as possible. These aspects of what our readers like to see change little, but how the beauty is perceived does change. A good photograph of a beautiful lady will always be beautiful regardless of trends. That is the signature of art in the medium.

EMERALD: Is Playboy pornography?

CHAN: That is what the minority group will want to say, for the minority involved in any issue always speaks the loudest. A definition of pornography depends on who is looking at it and judging it. I can't speak for other people and cannot know what they want to believe, but I know it is not pornography. If it was, I wouldn't be working with Playboy. What I do is art.

EMERALD: Some say that Playboy, considered soft pornography, is still part of the continuum that leads to the degradation of women. Your reply?

CHAN: I don't think we degrade women. No, it is the opposite. We put them on a higher plateau than what really exists. When we shoot, we make it possible for women to do what they, often times, did not think

Continued on Page 3