

Letters

Not dreamy

The Democratic primary for county commissioner is boiling down to a three-person race between Doug Melevin, ex-assistant district attorney, businessman Archie Weinstein and incumbent Nancy Hayward. The primary is important for any student who intends to be in the area for the next year or two and very important for those who plan to live in Eugene.

Doug Melevin trained for county commissioner as Pat Horton's assistant D.A. He served in the era when Oregon's progressive marijuana laws were passed and, as assistant D.A., Melevin was a key influence in the program's success.

Melevin's approach to the jail issue is another example of his down to earth progressive realism. Where Nancy Hayward dreamily envisions the county providing a state rehabilitation center costing \$11.7 million, Melevin has realized that the people will not support such a project. The jail bond issue will not pass this May because it was unrealistic of Nancy Hayward to expect the county voters to support that expense.

The county does need a new jail, immediately! Doug Melevin has been researching for alternatives and has studied new jails built in Charleston, South Carolina and San Jose, California, for much less than \$11.7 million.

His idea is for a new jail on the present site that would be modern, clean and safe for inmates. It would be a custody-oriented jail with congestion eliminated and a special block which could hold more violent prisoners so that your best friend who got busted for driving under the influence doesn't have to bunk on top of the guy who just knocked two policemen unconscious in a bar. Later, in consultation with state people and with help from state funds, the county can look into rehabilitation centers for local persons who are state inmates.

This is Doug Melevin's second campaign for elected office. He has dealt with problems directly, realistically and humanely. He does not promise solutions that he can't deliver. He does not promise dreamy answers that can't come true.

Howard A. Pergament
journ. grad.

Reduction opposed

I would like to bring to your readers' attention, the recent Department of Defense budget proposal to reduce the strength of the Selected Naval Reserve to a dangerously low level of 52,000 members in October of 1976.

This reduction of the current 102,000 drilling population of the naval reserve ignores all manpower requirements for a viable reserve force. Any arbitrary reduction aimed exclusively at budget reduction without the due regard for mobilization requirements seriously impairs the effectiveness of the naval reserve program and has serious implications for national defense.

The United States active duty military forces are already being reduced at a time when the Soviets are strengthening their military forces far beyond defensive requirements. Soviet naval vessels already outnumber ours. The Soviets are continuing to expand their 2,000 vessel fleet while ours has been pared below 500 in recent years.

It is vitally important that a strong reserve be maintained when our active duty forces are operating at reduced manning levels. Studies have shown that reservists can maintain vitally needed defense skills at one sixth of the cost of their active counterparts.

The Reserve Officers' Association and the Naval Reserve Association have voiced strong objections to the proposal to both the Secretary of Defense and President Ford. However, the administration has indicated it will not reverse its decision. I think you will agree that all naval reserve billets which have been validated as being needed in event of war or national emergency should be filled. This Department of Defense proposal sounds the death knell on the citizen-soldier-sailor concept upon which the foundations of our free democratic country are based.

I strongly urge your readers to alert their Congressional representatives of the administration's misguided efforts to save a few dollars and to strongly protest this action until the administration reverses its decision.

Harry O. Wiedmaier
Captain, U.S. Naval Reserve
Portland, Representative
Readiness Commander, Seattle

Button given

As Betty Ford left the Fishbowl, her Secret Service guardians let me shake her hand and say: (I had detached the large black and white button that says: PRO-homo-sapiens and gave it to her) "I am an Episcopal minister, Betty... This is the strongest, most moral, most LAWful word in all language. Give it to Jerry, will you?" She replied simply: "I will." So what? So this: No one reading this will deny that all of our comfort civilization is composed solely of good ideas; which couldn't work till they were tried. Bell knew his phone would work, but it could not till wires were strung. Same way with WORLDLAW: Anytime President Ford will issue an executive order to command it, he can initiate a securely warless order, perfected society as follows: "As Constitutionally Commander-in-Chief I hereby order: No man may live within the sovereign United States of America unless he wills no less than 100 per cent defensive of homo-sapiens. If a man would rather die than comply, we have to let him have his way and kill him in self-defense. Why? Because we have to kill mortal enemies or they would kill us. Is this the only total self-defense of our country? Yes. This order makes it effective within our sovereign boundaries."

We don't live but once, so make the most of it. Above is described the only best possible. As the British poet put it: "Gather ye rosebuds while ye may/Old time is still a flying/So this same flower that blooms today/Tomorrow may be dying."

I couldn't quite persuade classmate Tom McCall (pol. sci. '36) to initiate this above described WORLDLAW by executive order here in our best of American states, Oregon, but at least he did tell me: "I believe you." It's past high time for Sen. Ed Fadeley to keep his two-year-old promise to me to introduce WORLDLAW legislation in Salem.

PRO-homo-sapiens,
(court-ordered name)
education, '36



opinion

Public purchase of timberland urged

Are there ways by which the state can break the annual budget battle for schools, finance the public college and university system, and, at the same time, obtain compliance with the sustained yield law for private timberlands?

One possible way, which I first suggested to then-Rep. Stafford Hansel, is for the state or the county or even the University to own its own timberlands and run them on sustained yield. Logs could be sold to cooperative units or to small mills of under 500 employees.

Now that the governor has proposed that the state take over Bonneville power for Oregon, would it be possible to suggest that the state buy the private timberlands? For too long the industry has paid very little tax-wise as compared to other businesses (Lindholm, University of Oregon study). The tax reductions of 1961, passed upon assurance of sustained yield forestry on their lands, resulted mainly in increasing the timber acreage owned or leased by big corporations since the tax on land and timber is now so low that lands rarely go back to the county for tax delinquency. With all the subsidies that timber gets, it is doubtful that the industry pays as much to the counties now as does the Forest Service in its in-lieu-of-taxes. Two steps are needed at once. Return the tax to a 20 per cent severance tax, equal to 1961 ad valorem. Restructure State Board of Forestry with five members, appointed

from nominations of bona fide environmental clubs.

As a trial run, the badly depleted timber lands of Lane County (only 17 years left according to the 1976 Beuter report) could be obtained on a revenue bond issue, placed — for a change — on a sustained-yield basis with proceeds apportioned to the colleges, universities and public schools. In time this would tend to eliminate or lessen the annual increase in residential property tax levies. No timber could be shipped overseas because state law forbids this.

Lane County would be a particularly good choice for public purchase since in 1940 it was called the lumber capital of the world. Now, instead, it can be called the shambles of a great forest county. In his 1969 study, Kehrli (University of Oregon) stated that the 1961 tax bonanza to industry was supposed to bring good management on private industry forest lands, but that there was no evidence that their rate of depletion had been slowed down. In fact, it speeded up in Lane County. There ought to be a lot of cut over, burned over land in Lane County available for state or county purchase for permanent forests instead of the cut and get out forests of private industry.

Charles Quaintance
professor emeritus
ecology and genetics

Different focus

Many things are subject to interpretation, but the editorial note in response to Mr. Hastings' letter to the editor on May 7 was not. It was clearly a case of not being able to see farther than the tip of one's nose. What Mr. Hastings was concerned about was a valid piece of feedback for an objective editorship. One might interpret his comments as suggesting that the *Emerald* might reach out beyond its own front door to other newsworthy things happening on the campus and in its community. Looked at in a different way — it is like the difference between having the editorial camera eye aimed at the campus community (focusing in on the ASUO activities) versus having the camera eye constantly blinking at the ASUO suite (focusing in on the ASUO life and hard times).

To Mr. Hastings letter came a knee jerk response from the *Emerald* editor. First something about some \$76.50 figure (for every student during the school year) requiring attention. And then something about "an extreme minority," which Mr. Hastings by his remarks is supposed to exemplify. There are enough people charged with the responsibility for watching over the student monies collected that the *Emerald* can simply report on how it is being done. The "extreme minority" is

not Mr. Hastings, but the people who relate to the activities of the ASUO office in disproportion to its relative importance to the overall educational institution and the community which it inhabits and influences. The *Emerald* is now in danger of becoming far too defensive. The *Emerald* should be doing the reporting. Let the ASUO be responsive and defensive; responsible to its constituency (all of it) and defending its own actions.

Frank J. Geltner, Jr.
speech, grad.

Send a message

I see from the recent election results that in spite of the ASUO's massive effort to establish its validity through the vote-by-mail procedure, fully 87 per cent of the students still feel that the ASUO is not worth their time. And 22 per cent of the rest of the students feel so strongly that the ASUO is worthless that they registered their dissatisfaction by voting for Jim (Izzy) Whetstone.

I suggest that if 10 per cent of the students want to play their political games that's their business, but they have no right to collect over one million dollars in incidental fees from the rest of us to finance their pet projects. I further suggest that any ASUO-funded program which is worthwhile

could continue to survive by charging dues to its members of fees for its services, and any program which could not survive that way should not exist. Finally, I suggest that everyone who agrees with me should protest the ASUO by writing in Whetstone for president in the upcoming run-off election. This is probably illegal, but do it anyway — maybe someone will get the message.

I. David Reingold
chemistry, grad.

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. Because of space limitations, letters must be no more than 250 words, typed, triple-spaced, dated and signed with the person's major. No unsigned letters will be published. Longer opinion columns will be published whenever possible after being submitted to the editorial page editor. The limit on opinion columns is 800 words, using the same format as letters.