

For Burrows

Oregonians know I have a short fuse when it comes to public officials attempting to torpedo our progressive attempts at orderly land use planning.

One legislator who has refused to knuckle under to pressures by those who desire to pillage and plunder for profit is Rep. Mary Burrows of Eugene.

During her two sessions in the Legislature, Mary has spoken and acted in the best interests of her district and of all Oregonians.

She serves only one special interest: The public interest.

I hope the people of Lane County will keep Mary's independent voice speaking for all of us.

L.B. Day
1391 Warren St. S.
Salem, Ore.

For Jerry Rust

As a long time political activist, I am accustomed to seeking the "better" candidates while being personally disgruntled with the general quality of persons attracted to run for office. This year Jerry Rust has offered his services to the county and that single act has rekindled my hope and excitement that we may truly gain command of our future.

I have worked with Jerry and I have argued the issues with Jerry. He is a man of courage, vision, and understanding — a natural leader. He truly cares about our future and would never use his office as a forum to enhance his future electability. He will carry issues directly to the people, no matter how unpopular they may appear, and he will forcefully articulate his proposals so that we may all have an informed opinion.

Jerry Rust is a man of character and foresight who know the limits of our resources and will work toward a more stable and independent local economy. A vote for Jerry Rust is a wise investment in our future.

Jack Delay
Candidate for City Council

For Frohnmeyer

I am writing this letter in support of Dave Frohnmeyer for reelection to the State House of Representatives. After having worked with him over the last year concerning problems of great interest and importance to myself, I can say with all sincerity that Prof. Frohnmeyer is the most sensitive and concerned politician I have ever dealt with. I find him willing to discuss, search out, and act upon issues in a manner showing both wisdom and integrity — commodities I find increasingly rare in Oregon politics of late.

Charles Silverstein
Educational Psychology

Save our land

When Gov. McCall signed into law Senate Bill 100, back in 1973, he put into effect a measure that would inevitably control land use in Oregon. The bill, still working today, provides that comprehensive land use planning take place at the local level. It insists that citizens be provided the opportunity to participate in land use decisions throughout the planning process and it creates a partnership between state and local government in coordinating land use.

If measure 10 passes Senate Bill 100 will be repealed and so will our right to determine just how our land should be used. If 10 passes

it will encourage urban sprawl on farm lands — the same kind that has ruined California.

Your no vote on 10 won't stop the inevitable growth in Oregon but rather will demand that builders and land users meet specific criteria before their endeavors take place.

A no vote on 10 is a vote yes for wise regulation!

Save Our Land!

Steve Bonini
Senior, F.A.A.

For Jack Delay

Once in a while a candidate for office steps forward that you want to help. Jack Delay is such a candidate. For a number of years I have worked with and known Jack Delay. We have discussed the issues. Jack supports the nuclear safeguards initiative. He not only opposes "urban sprawl", but he has strong ideas leading to solutions. Jack will work for mass transit and bike trails. He knows we need a strong local economy based on labor-intensive, non-polluting industry. In short, he is one candidate who will work for a "more livable Eugene". I endorse him without reservation, as a friend and fellow worker. Vote for Jack Delay for City Council.

Jerry Rust
33737 Witcher Gateway Road
Cottage Grove

ODE for Nixon?

What candor! What nerve! What originality!

Who else would have endorsed for the county's chief law enforcer a man who is "sometimes less than honest"? To hell with honesty! Results, that's what we want!

The citizenry of Lane County is surely sophisticated enough to understand that integrity belongs behind closed doors, and certainly shouldn't be publicly flaunted by our district attorney.

Thank you, Emerald, for recognizing and addressing our collective higher consciousness.

And I am eagerly awaiting your Presidential endorsement: He may have been "sometimes less than honest" but at least he got results. And although you rarely endorse Republicans, I'll admire your leaving ideology behind as I read that inspiring headline: "Write in — RMN!"

Sharon Gordon
3rd Year, Law

For Whipple

Norma Paulus plans to spend \$138,000 to Blaine Whipple's \$48,000 in the race for the office of Secretary of State.

No wonder Ms. Paulus opposes ballot measure number 7, public funding of election campaigns, which attempts to reduce the influence of money in politics and make our politicians less reliant on the special interests for campaign funding. Nixon's 1972 \$60 million re-election campaign paid for by the corporations is a lesson apparently lost on Ms. Paulus.

As for me I'm sick and tired of Republican, big-money campaigns. Vote for Blaine Whipple and ballot measure number 7 and tell Norma Paulus and her rich Republican friends what they can do with it.

David McTeague
Junior, Political Science

R-G cronyism

When a newspaper takes the opportunity to endorse one candidate over another, it also assumes the responsibility to investigate each candidate and the issues, and to fully inform the readers of the reasons for the resulting endorsement. It is a serious breach of the public's trust to endorse without such investigation and disclosure. It is clear to me, having both read the Register-Guard's endorsement of Charles Pressman over Camilla Pratt and then having talked to the editor who wrote it, that the public was ill-served in this case.

The R-G editor has the impression that nuclear power is "no longer an issue at EWEB". I had to remind him that I was publicly rebuked several months ago by the other four pro-nuclear board members when I said I believed the board was not interested in further nuclear investments. Pressman's literature says hesitant things about nuclear energy, but like the other board members he hopes to join, he doesn't support Ballot Measure 9 (Nuclear Safeguards). He has indeed lived in Eugene for many years, but did nothing to help delay EWEB's ill-fated Big Creek Nuclear plant in 1970's election. Are we now to trust him to effectively present the disadvantages of nuclear power to the other four board members?

The R-G editor cannot see that he is advocating a return to the familiar 5 to 0 business-input-only kind of board that was lead into Trojan and up to Big Creek, that bad-mouthed conservation ("it'll cut into revenues!"), that scoffed at wind energy research, that contributed \$10,000 yearly to the Chamber of Commerce and \$35,000 yearly to the Fast Breeder Reactor. These were reasonable-sounding positions back then, when there was no one on the board to fight for the "other side." The four businessmen now on EWEB are capable, honest and sincere; they are also thoroughly business-oriented, as is Pressman. Of course we need some businessmen on EWEB, but what of other views? The Frank-Schmidt 1974 EWEB race ended in a virtual tie; two votes difference out of over 28,000 cast. Yet this R-G editor would deprive 50 per cent of these voters of even one voice on EWEB!

Camilla Pratt, vastly better informed on nuclear, conservation, solar, and Bonneville Power issues; thoroughly familiar with the board's procedures and problems (having attended our meetings for over two years), a proven worker for conservation education, was passed over for a man who never attended an EWEB meeting until he suddenly announced his candidacy in August; who says vague things about nuclear misgivings and distributes photos of himself posing on the issues that he has done nothing to develop.

Why? Because Charles Pressman is a "long-time friend" of the editor. I consider that to be cronyism, not journalism; it has no place on the editorial staff of the Eugene Register-Guard.

Please look beyond, to the actual records of these two candidates, one of whom will soon replace me on EWEB: then join me in voting for Camilla Pratt for Wards 2 and 3, EWEB.

John S. Reynolds
Commissioner,
Eugene Water & Electric Board

Imperialism in Oman

During the presidential debates Mr. Ford repeatedly stated that "today the United States is at peace, no single American soldier is fighting abroad."

This is a lie. Mr. Ford, following the carefully orchestrated plans of Kissinger and Nixon, has increased the U.S. military presence in the country of Oman located at the tip of the Gulf. The heart of the strategy, as expressed by Nixon's first-term Defense Secretary, Melvin Laird, is that "Each partner does its share and contributes what it best can to the common effort. In the majority of cases, this means indigenous manpower organized into properly equipped and well-trained armed forces with the help of material, training, technology and specialized skills furnished by the United States."

True to this strategy, 50,000 Iranian soldiers have been trained by nearly 20,000 U.S. military advisors and technicians, equipped with the most advanced U.S. army equipment and taught, under the direct supervision of the U.S. military, to operate the most sophisticated armaments in the imperialist arsenal (F-14s, F-16s, F-18s and destroyers) some of which the U.S. military does not possess.

These Iranian soldiers, recruited from remote, poor villages in Iran, are re-educated and now constitute the new "American" soldier. 30,000 of these "American" soldiers are now fighting in Oman against the PFLO (Popular Front for the Liberation of Oman), a mass-based progressive revolutionary movement.

The "common effort" for which these soldiers are being used is the protection of the imperialist's interests. What does Oman have that would interest the imperialists?

1. Oman is located strategically at the mouth of the Gulf through which the super-tankers, carrying oil from Saudi Arabia and Iran, pass.

2. The Gulf area is the site of 70 per cent of the world's oil and the revolutionary movement of the PFLO is considered the gravest of threats.

The Kissinger-Nixon policy of indirect control and increasing U.S. strategic mobility has been faithfully followed by Mr. Ford. Greater emphasis is laid on air and sea movement, and on maintaining supply bases in remote areas: while out of sight of angry populations, they will serve as the basis for deploying troops in crises and for backing up neo-colonial regimes that may be in difficulties.

A basic thesis of U.S. preparedness today is that they are able to establish a large air and troop base anywhere in the world within 24 hours, provided only that water is locally available. The new U.S. navy is based on such a conception of rapid strategic mobility and support for ground troops. The U.S. has been acquiring bases in the Gulf area for just these purposes. In Bahrain, a neighboring state to Oman, the U.S. arranged to lease the al-Jufair naval base and recently, under the Ford administration, the U.S. has moved onto the islands of Maserah, located off the South East Oman Coast, and Diego Garcia, spending an approximate \$45 million to expand the naval and air facilities of the islands.

The advantages of the Kissinger-Nixon-Ford doctrine are obvious: 1. protection of U.S. oil interests; 2. indirect control of the area while the major cost is borne by the oil revenues of Saudi Arabia and Iran; 3. no "American born" soldier will fight in Oman unless the situation "gets out of hand." As stated by Omani Foreign Minister Kawawai in October 1974, and which still holds true today, "the Iranian presence in Oman might possibly be replaced by a more effective presence from the United States."

Under the Ford Administration, Sultan Qaboos, the ruler of Oman, received in January, 1975, authorization to buy U.S. helicopters, sophisticated electronic equipment, and anti-tank missiles. Oman was assessed by the CIA as being the "safest" part of the Gulf in which to establish a U.S. presence. The U.S.-Oman accord of January 1975 "entails some sort of physical American presence in Oman."

The liberation struggle, begun in 1965 under the leadership of the PFLO, is a progressive mass struggle which seeks the liberation of the Omani people from the yoke of imperialism. We must not be fooled by the rhetoric of politicians such as Mr. Ford, nor remain unknowledgeable as to what is happening. The struggle in Oman is our struggle. For more information contact: Gulf Solidarity Committee, P.O. Box 3784, Eugene, Oregon.

Submitted by Ahmad Ashrafi
For the Gulf Solidarity Committee

Clear choices

The two County Commissioner contests are perhaps the most critical of this election. The five candidates for the two positions have sharply different points of view and political backgrounds. The choices are clear between progressive responsibility and clearly conservative-to-reactionary irresponsibility.

We respect and admire two above the rest: Jerry Rust and John Parkhurst. Both favor progressive government, responsible land-use planning, and well-reasoned problem-solving. Lane County has made much positive progress in becoming — and stay-

ing — an excellent place to live: Jerry Rust and John Parkhurst will continue to seek positive progress in Lane County government at minimal cost to taxpayers.

We believe in well-reasoned common sense government, carried out by devoted public servants with professional care and expertise: Jerry and John meet those standards, and can best represent all of Lane County with equity. Vote for Jerry Rust and John Parkhurst November 2nd: you'll still appreciate them in June.

Jon M. Spangler
Senior, General Social Science
David R. Claussen
Senior, Psychology
Friday, October 29, 1976