

Let the dust settle

The Lane County Commissioner's decision last Wednesday to eliminate the post of chief administrator — along with other positions in the upper echelons of the county bureaucracy — has aroused intense reactions ranging from recall threats to promises of enthusiastic support.

The appropriate reaction is to wait until the dust settles before passing judgment on the plan.

Commissioners Jerry Rust and Archie Weinstein, the two board members who voted to reorganize the county's administrative structure, were elected last fall on promises to make county government more responsive to the needs and desires of ordinary citizens. Making the various county department heads directly responsible to elected officials is certainly a step toward fulfilling that promise.

Those who say the chief administrator system has given Lane County a wide reputation for efficiency have a compelling argument. It's true that counties in Oregon and elsewhere have looked to Lane County as a model for their own government structures.

The reorganization plan, however, will give the county a good chance to see just how much of its effectiveness can be attributed to the chief administrator system. Perhaps Lane County's good government should be credited to Home Rule, citizen participation and O and C timber receipts. This may sound like tearing down a building to see how strong it is, but it's a worthwhile experiment, one that can always be reversed.

The aspect of the reorganization controversy most deserving of criticism is the way in which the matter was handled by the commissioners. Rust popped the proposal on an unprepared constituency and, with Weinstein's help, ramrodded the plan through without adequate public discussion or examination of possible results. Commissioner Bob Wood helped intensify the emotionally charged atmosphere surrounding the controversy by reacting as though the plan was calculated to personally offend him.

For better or for worse, the plan was approved. The manner in which Rust's proposal was advanced, debated and passed leaves much to be desired, but concern should now be directed toward making sure the Commissioners work together to guarantee the greatest possible success of the reorganization plan.

The commissioners set themselves a tight timetable for implementation of the plan, and many of the details of the new system remain unclear. Rust, Wood and Weinstein should forget their personal differences and try to exercise the administrative functions they assigned the commission wisely. And if at any moment it becomes apparent that the reorganization plan will detract from the county's efficiency and responsiveness, the commissioners should have the vision and maturity to admit they made a mistake and restore some form of the chief administrator system.

Letters

Modify HEP

After reading the letters dealing with the HEP program and the killing recently, I was really appalled by some of the responses and solutions offered by people. I am speaking specifically about the letter suggesting utilizing the funds now used by the HEP program for more "advantageous" things. The HEP program, in theory, is great. The thought of providing people with an education who otherwise couldn't get one, is one of the best uses of our tax money I can think of.

However, after living in a dorm with several HEP students, and with what happened, I have come to the conclusion that there are faults within the HEP program. I have had contact with HEP students who are grateful that they are being given this opportunity and are using it to their greatest advantage. I have also spoken to some whose main reason for being here is that they get \$10 per week to buy pot, cigarettes, or booze.

This shows me there must be a better method of selecting people who should be able to make use of this program. The HEP program is a fantastic opportunity for someone who wants to make use of it. The HEP program shouldn't be

used by people who take advantage of this opportunity. There should be more in depth screening of prospective HEP students, and once they are here, there should be more strict control over them.

At the outset of the program, they should be advised that any kind of mess-up will result in them being kicked out of the program. They should be told exactly what is expected of them academically and socially, and if they mess up, they should be booted from the program. By staying within the given guidelines, the HEP students are showing that they realize the merits of the program, and are interested in making the most of it. At the same time they will be able to learn how to harmoniously co-exist with college students.

The letter was right to the extent that we shouldn't waste money on people who are not here to use the program, but the answer is not to abolish the program, but to modify the program so it can better attain its goals.

Ron Bamberger
Freshman-Business

Varied coverage

In reply to Steve Fulton, regarding his letter "Emphasize sports," Friday, Feb. 25:



THE CONGRESSMAN WHO PROPOSED A PAY CUT

Mr. Fulton, I sympathize with your desire to see the Emerald widen its coverage of sports, as the present attention given to others. However, your blatant denouncement of minority and special-interest groups was uncalled-for.

You feel that the Emerald should "report on points of interest of the average student." How would you go about determining "average," Mr. Fulton? Is every person who attends or participates in popular events considered average? How would you determine what the average student wants to read? If s/he wanted to read about sports, which ones would you choose? Would you give equal coverage to all, including some lesser-mentioned ones, such as archery, bowling, chess, fencing, and golf? Or would you confine your coverage to the more popular athletics?

You mentioned that "5,000 students — one third of the student body — applied for athletic passes." I would wager that the majority purchased them with basketball in mind. If the average student is interested in basketball, does this mean that the Emerald should devote their time exclusively to it?

Among other things, a good local newspaper should reflect the interests and activities of the people in its community. I would hope to think that the "average" university-educated student has a variety of interests, including those both popular and unpopular. Students who close themselves off to the possibilities of everything except what confirms their own values live counter to what a true university represents.

Sports are an important concern on this campus, but we also have student unions, alliances, brigades, committees, and other special-interest groups which prove that students are concerned with and willing to support other things besides sports.

T. Kim McDonald
Junior-Theatre

Oppose annexation

An open City Council meeting at 7:30 tonight will determine whether 390 acres and 4,000 people will soon be added to the city of Eugene.

The Breeden Brothers developers and former Mayor Ed Cone want to build a major subdivision in the Coburg Rd. Beltline area. If approved, this proposal would have a number of negative consequences for Eugene residents: increased traffic congestion, more pollution, and increased demand for city services (schools, sewers, fire, police and road maintenance) which can only mean higher taxes.

This proposal raises several

questions about Eugene's future. Why are houses built primarily for high and middle income people when the main need is housing for low and moderate income families, students and senior citizens?

Why is a large tract of prime agricultural land used for subdivision development?

Will the developers emphasize energy conservation or build all-electric energy-guzzling houses?

This is part of a continuing pattern of urban sprawl. Eugene's growth too long has been determined by the desire of private developers to make profitable investments. Shouldn't we instead encourage planning for the needs of Eugene residents?

If you want to have some say over what your city will look like in 5, 10 and 25 years, come to tonight's meeting, 7:30 p.m. McNutt Room, City Hall, 777 Pearl St. Oppose the annexation.

Iris Dudman
Paul Harrison
Peter Dreier
Willamette Valley Chapter
New American Movement

Inexcusable act

After watching the broadcast of last Saturday afternoon's basketball game I must report that I have never witnessed a ruder, more inconsiderate team or crowd of fans. Rivalry we expect; however, the gross antics displayed by your homecourt athletes and coach indicate their obvious overall lack of talent. Otherwise Coach Harter would not have to instruct the players to fall down on the court to draw a foul nor rile the crowd to try to intimidate the guests. He knows if it came down to mere basketball he would rightfully fall on his face.

The most inexcusable act came during half-time when the fans lined the exit to the locker room to spit, shove, and shout obscenities to the visiting Bruin team. I am deeply ashamed to be included in the same conference with the University of Oregon.

If Coach Harter would concentrate on the potentially beautiful talent displayed by Ballard and Murray and scrap the bullshit then your school would have a basketball team. When both teams play good basketball then we'll see some real action and a real game. A reply would be welcomed.

Jacqueline Smith
Senior, UCLA
2019 21st St.
Santa Monica, CA
90404

Socialist solution

Luckily for Prof. Robert Campbell, he did succeed in his effort to be cute. Nothing else recom-

mends him in his attack (ODE, Feb. 17) on Peter Dreier's opinion column (ODE, Feb. 9).

If Prof. Campbell has evidence that most modern private investment is not capital intensive, let him produce it. Let's have his evidence that business investment incentives paid for by our taxes create large numbers of new jobs. The point, Mr. Campbell, as you well know, is not that businessmen are greedy, but that they are forced by the laws of capitalism to seek the highest profit, whether or not they care about "our expense."

While I don't agree with Prof. Dreier that nationalization is a solution, he is at least in the ballpark. Nationalization under capitalism can only be a subsidy for the corporations (at our expense, Mr. Campbell). Examples are the railroads, highways and other infrastructures here and in other capitalist and dependent countries.

However, if the vast majority of the people of this country — those who've created all its wealth — seized power and took back all that wealth stolen by a small handful of capitalists — that would be the road to a solution: socialism. Obviously this is what Mr. Campbell fears, indicated by his inuendo about China. In China, workers are also teachers and students. Teachers also spend time working. Mr. Campbell fears socialism because economics professors actually get their hands dirty. How terrible to help harvest the food you eat! (Mr. Campbell also has the hysterical false notion that a socialist U.S. would take away his color t.v. set.)

Perhaps Mr. Campbell might have improved on his apologies for capitalism if he had gone to New England last month and tried to thaw a few people who froze when the gas was turned off. Or he might spend some time at any unemployment office, standing in line to argue the merits of 7.8% vs. 8.1% unemployment with the unemployed.

Don't worry about re-education, Mr. Campbell. They haven't invented shit shovels that big.

Jonathan Draper
Graduate-Political Science

Letters policy

The Emerald will accept and try to print all letters to the editor. Letters must be typed, double-spaced and signed. The length limit on letters is 300 words. The writer's name, major and class standing should be printed legibly on all letters. Hand-written letters or letters without complete identification of the writer are generally not published.