

Law School turns away undergrads

If Randy Newman can write a song about short people, the law school can come up with a song of similar cadence explaining why they "don't want no undergrads round here."

The Law School has announced that undergraduates will no longer be welcome in the Law Library or law school classrooms. Citing complaints about noise levels, uncleanliness and the like, law school Dean Chapin Clark told undergraduates that they can find someplace else to study.

That decision means next time you're working on a paper and want to check out a point of law, you won't be able to use the best source of law-related material around. Also, if you just plain get an itch to do some independent study in law, you won't have access to the law library.

ASUO Pres. Gary Feldman was upset by Clark's announcement and he says he'll challenge the decision on legal grounds. There's a good case against barring undergraduate students from the law facilities. The law school was constructed and is operated by state funds. Because of that, students — all students — should have access to the school. It is a valuable resource that can't be closed to all but a select breed of law students.

Under Clark's logic, law students would have the run of the University, but such a privilege wouldn't be granted other students. To be consistent, Clark also would have to support a decision to bar law students from the main library and classrooms outside of the law school. Obviously that would be foolish and so is the plan to keep undergraduates out of the law school.

It seems to us that the whole issue could have been handled by more subtle means. If undergraduates — or law students — are being excessively noisy, why not just tell them to shut up? Other students do it and law students should be capable of channeling their energy in to such a simple task.

Letters

Cheap shot

In reference to Jack Fields' letter (Feb. 8) attacking Neil Gruenfelder's article on Oregon mascot Ray Byers, it reminds me of a little boy who throws a rock at a passing car then runs off and hides. The cheap shots thrown at the Emerald and Byers had absolutely no backing at all.

Fields charged the story was a "blatant waste of paper," "a joke" and a "great injustice" to pass it off as "something newsworthy."

Granted the story is not page one news and it probably didn't even belong in the sports supplement, but Fields never once stated why readers are not curious about Oregon's mascot nor did he cite any flaws in the actual writing style. Gruenfelder wrote an inciteful feature on a student who will perform in a duck's mask before 10,500 people 15 times this year. If you don't think that's newsworthy or of human interest Mr. Fields, then maybe you don't belong in journalism.

The cheap shot at the end, "And do us a favor Ray, wear your head all the time. Quack! Quack!" was the most spineless crack of all.



Fields never stated what exactly it is about Ray he doesn't like or if he even dislikes him at all. It was just a weak, pointless slam which not only made a mockery of the article and Ray, but the letters column as well.

But it was good to get that off your chest, right Mr. Fields? Well congratulations, you were a tower of jello.

John Henderson
Senior, Journalism

Begin's arms antics

This writer's patience for Menachem Begin's deplorable antics are wearing thin. Recently Begin blasted Sadat's request for U.S. aid as being a "negative development" in the quest for peace. I might have agreed with the assessment were it not for the fact that the words were uttered by a man whose nation is a chief benefactor of that aid; to the tune of \$3 billion since 1973. (If Sadat gains his request, Egypt will receive U.S. weapons for the first time).

I find it hard to believe that Israel's receipt of U.S. military aid is any less of a "negative development" than Sadat's request for equal treatment. Israeli officials apparently see no contradiction in claiming a goal of peace while receiving armaments of war. But let the Arabs attempt the feat and suddenly it becomes a condemnable act.

Begin claims that the Arabs will use the weapons against the Jews, certainly a legitimate concern. Yet where was that concern when Israel used U.S. Phantom jets to decimate the Arab nations in June of 1967? I doubt Begin was very concerned when Israel chose to double her existing borders by retaining the Arab territory they gained through forced seizure.

Are we to assume that its all right for Israelis to use U.S. weapons to defend themselves against the Arabs, but not vice-versa? Are we to assume that it's alright for Israelis to use those arms to expand her borders into Arab land, but not vice-versa? Who is Begin trying to fool? Instead of serving the interests of peace, Begin's statement is self-serving and pathetically two-faced.

I refuse to buy the Prime Minister's logic, for if the Arab request is detrimental to the efforts of Middle East peace, then Israel's actions are even more so.

Douglas Anderson
Senior, Political Science

Apology unneeded

Mr. Lee, why apologize for your lack of statistical data when Mr. Greene has only provided us with a mass of cliches and pedantic verbosity? In Mr. Greene's writings we've heard primarily of axes, knives and maladroitness.

melanges (good dictionary work there David!). We will now attempt to distill Mr. Greene's major point from his incoherent ramblings.

There was an instance of the "only one form of rational protest. Individual voice; individual choice" on this campus. The students voted for divestiture. What did this "rational protest" bring us? A classical example of the strategy of avoidance. When the "wrong" decision was made, the State Board couldn't act because there suddenly was a question as to whether or not they had the power to act. Our "irrational" protestors were wise enough to take an action that would not let the issue die.

A social issue as timely and appalling as apartheid must call forth a loud, collective outrage, a collective effort by those whose individual consciences require them to respond to an untenable situation. The protestations of one are a shot in the dark; the voices of a multitude resound like a cannon.

Mr. Greene, you seem to imply that "vicious" is an improper modifier when describing the apartheid system. Would you substitute "benevolent"? We would like to remind you of your suggestion; "if you've the desire to think, then you might consider standing up to relieve some of the pressure."

Rob Brown
Dave Lutz
Scott Thelin
Seniors, Economics

opinion

Tax exemption: a question of public benefit

Submitted by
Leigh Zahn

Fourth year Architecture

Regarding the Emerald's Jan. 19 article ("Housing option emerges for students") and the Eugene Register Guard article (City grants tax exemption):

Some background: State legislation allows for a residential multi-unit dwelling tax exemption for projects which incorporate "public benefits in (their) design." This legislation was intended to "revitalize central business districts by encouraging developments of multi-unit rental housing." For such a project to qualify, it must include "one or more design elements benefitting the general public."

The intent of this legislation is obviously good. It could possibly serve as a very positive tool for the city to use as an incentive for implementing its development goals through private enterprise.

There exists a problem with this legislation, however. The ambiguity of "public benefit" is

clearly working to the private benefit of a developer whose approved project — with a \$500,000 tax exemption — is of dubious public benefit.

Case history and decision: Russ Landrus, president of Diversified Development Co. (builder's of the controversial Skinner's Butte Apartments) proposed a new 107-unit apartment project called Broadway Center. It is located at Eighth Ave. between Broadway and Washington Streets. In this project, he proposes the following "public benefits": Three "pocket parks" to be used by anyone, five units specifically designed for handicapped persons, a publicly accessible coin laundry and "open space" in the form of a parking lot. He claims these benefits will cost \$91,000.

I can see the "parks" — depending on how handled — and the handicapped accommodations as being in the spirit of public benefit. I do not see a coin-op laundry as a benefit to anyone but

the laundry machine owners. Most apartment complex laundries tend to be used by nearby residents anyway. And I certainly cannot see an "open space" parking lot as a public benefit! The audacity of the developer to even claim the cost of the laundry and parking lot as a part of the justification for a \$500,000 tax exemption is an insult to the tax-paying public. For it is the public who is subsidizing Diversified Development.

This project was hailed by the Emerald as an housing option for students. It would be more beneficial to students and the public alike if the tax exemption savings were passed on to tenants in the form of lower rents. If the rent schedule of the Skinner's Butte project is any indication, I doubt many students will be able to comfortably afford to live there.

Take heart. Almost. There were three city councilmen (Bradley, Lieuallen and Williams, who did concur essentially with the

questionable public benefits thesis. Lieuallen correctly stated, "It's not enough to say we're providing housing downtown. The place has got to be worth living in. A laundromat is not enough of a public benefit." Moreover, he was "concerned about the design and durability of the project." These are certainly legitimate concerns considering Diversified's track record and questionable aesthetics and quality at the sensitive Skinner's Butte area.

But mayor Gus Keller and council members Hamel, Haws, Obie, and Smith approved the project. Thus Diversified's claim for one-half million dollars in exchange for a cost of \$90,000 in dubious public benefit was complete. What a bargain!

A lesson in potential pitfall: The ambiguity of "public benefit." Lieuallen went on to say, "more specific public benefit guidelines are needed." Although well intended and obviously meant to prevent future questionable

projects, let's think twice about "defined guidelines" as a remedy: maybe just a greater level of awareness and foresight on the part of the four council members voting "yes" would have averted what is at best a marginal project proposal.

Public benefit well-defined could serve to endanger the good intentions of the original legislation. It has happened many times before. Once certain progressive government legislation becomes "well-defined," it may lose the effective flexibility to deal with the issues it was originally intended to deal with. Adaptability to different sets of complex issues is the key to attempting to deal with unique, urban-generated problems.

Take away the flexibility of unique solutions for unique and unpredictable city problems, and the legislation will be useless. Then the public certainly won't benefit!

Tuesday, February 14, 1978