

Right on, Al

The recent article by Professor Al Szymanski ("Breaking Business Ties Essential in Serving the Needs of People," Forum Contemplates University Past, Present, Future, Daily Emerald, Friday, Oct., 18, 1976) expresses acute perception and extreme accuracy in assessing the realities of University institutional development.

Articles by such exciting thinkers are greatly overdue and drastically needed by the Daily Emerald in the future. I would just like to add one additional point to the article: Not only does the University of Oregon (and other universities as well) suffer from overwhelming corporate manipulations and controls, it also has to contend with one of the most corrupt political and governmental institutions as its primary professional job recruiter — CIA!

Thanks for the germ of University reality, Professor Szymanski.

Jeffrey Liss
Graduate Student
Political Science

Wrong label

I have noticed that lately there has been a widespread tendency to mistakenly label Independent US congressional candidate Tonie Nathan as an arch-conservative. I can't say whether or not that tendency is consciously pursued by the media, but it is there, and her opponents seem more than willing to exploit it.

The fact remains, however, that the label simply does not fit. It is true that Tonie Nathan's strong basic belief in the sanctity of a person's life, and therefore the products of his or her labor, lead her to take a position in defense of free enterprise and against the usurpation of personal economic freedom by a centralized bureaucracy — positions traditionally ascribed to conservatives. Still, that same basic belief in our human rights has led Tonie to staunchly oppose the existing legal restrictions on our civil liberties; in particular to oppose those laws creating criminals despite the absence of victims — oppositions which would place her among the most liberal.

So the traditional viewpoint of the political spectrum cannot be used when one speaks of Tonie Nathan. She is truly an independent, truly an opponent of politics-as-usual. And, having known her for a few years now, a candidate I am sure we can count on to be forthright in the political applications of her ideals.

Kyle DeBord
Sophomore-Undeclared

Vote yes on 9

Just in case you're not familiar with the proponents of Measure 9, the nuclear safeguards act, I feel compelled to highlight exactly what this measure will mean if passed.

If passed, the energy industry will be required to prove that:

- Emergency systems in the plant have been tested successfully in operating conditions.
- Nuclear wastes can be guarded against sabotage or terrorist attacks.
- Nuclear wastes can be managed safely.

Measure 9 does not and will not apply to already existing power plants, such as Trojan, rather, it will force proposed plants to meet the above criteria before its construction takes place.

My deepest concern centers around radioactive wastes —

where and how to dispose of toxic bi-products from the nuclear process. To quote two Harvard professors, "Only the tiniest traces of plutonium are needed to induce cancer and if its use becomes widespread, the possibility must be faced of awful accidents, either accidental or deliberate, that will cause wide regions of our earth to become forever uninhabitable."

Radioactive wastes have already been produced in large amounts by the military and other sources. Our oceans are graveyards for thousands of drums containing wastes with half-lives of up to 50,000 years. These drums are leaking while we continue to lean heavily on the sea as a source of food. Can we be so presumptuous as to say that this waste will never enter the food chain? I think not.

"The general accounting office estimates that by the year 2000 there will be approximately 1 billion cubic feet of radioactive wastes — or the equivalent of a four lane highway from coast to coast, one foot deep." Tell me, do we need this? Couldn't our billions of dollars toward nuclear plants (which, by the way, are shut down much of the time) be used to explore solar or geothermal energy?

To sum up, nuclear power as such doesn't scare me — it's the repercussions stemming from the process itself. So ok, let's assume that the plants are safe — what accounts for human frailty? Machines may be foolproof but man certainly is not.

Please, vote yes on Ballot Measure Nine.

Steve Bonini
Senior-Fine Arts

Vote no on 10

As your retraction on Monday correctly pointed out, I oppose rather than favor Ballot Measure 10, as was earlier reported erroneously. For the many readers who did not see the retraction, allow me to state my position again.

Last session I voted for full funding of the Land Conservation and Development Commission. I would do so again to insure that vital land use decisions are properly made.

No doubt some technical amendments could facilitate LCDC relations with local governments. But that is a job for skillful and well-considered legislation, not the meat-axe of outright repeal.

Oregon's land is the birthright of our children's children. That is why I have joined willingly with other members of this community to oppose Ballot Measure 10. I hope your readers will join with us.

Dave Frohnmayer
State Representative
District 40

For Henderson

Mark Henderson is a candidate not to be overlooked in the contest for freshman class president. He would bring to this office a vast amount of experience gained from extensive participation in his high school's student government. More importantly, his energy, enthusiasm, and industriousness are presently needed to regenerate this class office back into a functioning, active position.

Mark Henderson is a dynamic individual, a capable leader, with an ability to motivate others. I heartily endorse his candidacy and urge all freshmen to vote Mark Henderson for freshman class president.

Jim Dulcich
EMU Board
Senior-Finance

Weaver's record supports re-election

In 1974, the Emerald endorsed Jim Weaver mostly because he offered an alternative to John Dellenback. This time around, Weaver can point to a record that more than justifies sending him back to Congress for another term.

At least three people in the fourth District would disagree (they're running against Weaver) but they should not be heeded.

Libertarian Tonie Nathan, running for the seat as an Independent, lacks an understanding of the issues facing the district. She opposes the concept of sustained yield, but offers no solution to the unemployment problems that will result if the forests are quick-cut over the next 20 years.

Independent Jim Howard is a moderate who leans liberal or conservative depending on which group he's talking to. About the only issue he is firmly committed on is abortion, and he opposes it under almost any circumstances.

Republican Jerry Lausmann appears to have constructed his campaign as a negative image of Weaver's. Lausmann (whose ads say to pronounce it Laws-man) favors allowing quick-cutting of the forests, the development of nuclear power, and maintaining the current power rates which charge less per unit the more power one consumes.

In comparison, Weaver offers progressive, often radical, plans to address the problems of the fourth District and the rest of the country. Look at his role in the debate on the recently passed timber management bill. Many environmentalists credit Weaver with heading off legislation that

would have killed our national forests.

While the rest of the Oregon congressional delegation remained silent or took the side of the timber industry, Weaver worked to insure that corporation profits (to be made from quick-cuts) took a back seat to the need for a lasting, steady timber supply. Weaver's efforts not only helped save the forests, but provided a stable base for the economy of the fourth District.

Weaver has also taken a firm stand against nuclear power. In the House, he voted to remove liability limitations contained in the Price-Anderson Act, voted against research funds for breeder reactor projects and has pushed for funds for solar research. Time and again, Weaver has worked against public subsidies of nuclear power, and has helped explode many of the myths concocted by the nuclear industry.

In another area of energy, Weaver has worked hard to get the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) out of the beds of the aluminum companies. Weaver filed suit to prevent the BPA from signing long-term contracts with industry, and if re-elected plans to introduce sweeping reforms of current energy practices. Included in those reforms are moves toward life-line rates that penalize large users with higher rates, rather than rewarding them with lower ones.

Weaver has also worked to save Rock Mesa, and French Pete and to preserve the rights of veterans in the face of arbitrary cuts in Veteran's funds by Pres. Ford.

In the final run, the fourth District has very little to gain, and everything to lose, by not returning Jim Weaver to Congress.

A thousand times no on measure 10

Think for a minute about what it means to live in Oregon. Every image that comes to mind concerns the land.

Oregon is a rich and diverse state, and its wealth and diversity come from the land. Our dependence on the land is total and final. Preserving the land and treating it gently is the first responsibility of everyone lucky enough to live here.

Our relationship with the land is so close and so obvious that Oregon is a leader in developing tools to help preserve it. Land use planning is the most powerful tool available to that end. That is why it is so terribly important that ballot measure number 10 be defeated.

Ballot measure 10 is a destructive proposal that would end state-wide land use planning coordination. It would repeal Oregon's major land use planning legislation, Senate Bills 10 and 100. It would abolish the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC), the agency that is responsible for putting the teeth in local planning.

Support for measure 10 has for the most part been organized and funded by Oregon realtors. In a crusade characterized by distortion and paranoia, measure 10's supporters claim LCDC is a planning dictatorship. They say Oregon's counties and towns do not need bigwigs from Salem coming in and telling them what to do with their land.

The fact is, LCDC does no planning at all. LCDC has not forced a single land use plan on anyone anywhere. All LCDC does is require local planning units to plan for the future in their areas and require that those plans meet certain specifications.

One of the specifications requires local planning units to provide for public participation in every step of the planning process. Local control and public participation — everything the supporters of measure 10 claim to be fighting for is contained in the legislation they want to repeal.

Everyone who speaks in favor of measure 10 begins by saying they support land use planning. They would like laws to prevent a pulp mill from being built next to their house. Mention laws that would prevent cities from sprawling over farmland, laws that would prevent coastal estuaries from being filled in, laws that would prevent Oregon's rivers from becoming industrial parks, and they scream bloody murder.

Because planning can change the value of land, some property tax changes are needed. Some people deserving of sympathy have been hurt by Senate Bills 10 and 100. There are retirees who must sell an acre of their land to pay the taxes on their property that have gone up with its value, but are not allowed to sell any less than 20 acres because of planning restrictions. What is needed in such cases is property tax reform, not wholesale repeal of land use planning legislation.

Measure 10 requires Oregonians to be as responsible, as thoughtful and as concerned about the future as any question on the November ballot. This is one vote that will have both immediate and long term effects; both visible and invisible consequences. It is imperative that this measure be defeated. The future of Oregon's land — and its people — depends on it.

Vote no on ballot measure number 10.