

Happy Thanksgiving!!



oregon daily emerald

Wednesday, November 21, 1984

Eugene, Oregon

Volume 86, Number 59

Final arguments presented

Discrimination trial ends

PORTLAND (AP) — Attorneys for faculty women and the state System of Higher Education presented closing arguments Tuesday in a mammoth sex-discrimination lawsuit believed to be the longest federal civil trial in Oregon history.

U.S. District Judge Helen Frye said she hoped to rule on the case by late December or early next year before becoming "lost" in the mountain of documents and evidence presented in the nine-month trial.

A class of 1,000 or more women is seeking tens of millions of dollars on behalf of women faculty members at Oregon's eight public universities and colleges. It is the first class-action lawsuit in the United States certified against an entire state system of higher education.

The lawsuit charges the women were victims of bias in pay, tenure, promotions and other areas.

"The statistical proof is bolstered by a tremendous pattern of individual instances," attorney Don Willner, who represented the women, said Tuesday.

State officials repeatedly denied responsibility

'Women of the state system want a fair salary without the anxiety and pressure of having constant checks on what that salary is.'

— JoAnn Reynolds

when accused of discrimination in personnel decisions, he said. Some college officials admitted they haven't followed state requirements for developing plans for compensating their academic staffs, he argued.

Women have received fewer promotions than men with comparable experience, education, ability and productivity, he said. Disparities in pay have grown worse over the years because most pay increases have been in percentages, not dollars.

At one University department where a department

head tried to equalize salaries, a dean found discretionary funds to award to four white males and maintain the disparity, said JoAnn Reynolds, Willner's associate.

"Women of the state system want a fair salary without the anxiety and pressure of having constant checks on what that salary is," Reynolds said.

Jerry Casby, an assistant Oregon attorney general who argued the state's case, said claims of discrimination amounted to a relative handful.

Of women who testified, only one claimed to have been denied advancement to an administrative position unfairly, 12 claimed discrimination in promotion, and 42 claimed discrimination in salary, he said.

"He simply doesn't have the numbers," Casby said, gesturing at Willner. "When you look behind the numbers and look at the substance of his claims, you don't see substance at all — you see gossamer."

The range of academic disciplines in the eight schools is so great that it is unfair to lump the programs together, he said. Studies submitted by the women omitted consideration of teaching quality, whether research had been published, how faculty members had served their institutions, and other factors, he said.

Willner, who challenged Casby's figures, said "we showed discrimination everywhere."

Although not all the bills are in, officials says the state has spent more than \$2.7 million in defense against the women's claims since April 1980, when the lawsuit was filed.

More than 2,200 women sought about \$40 million in the case, but Frye reduced the size of the class last summer by barring some non-teaching personnel.

Despite numerous negotiations prompted by repeated requests from Frye, the two sides failed to reach an out-of-court settlement.

Both sides cited statistical evidence to bolster their cases. Attorneys for the women also cited individual accounts, and state attorneys tried to refute them.

Some 692 documents and thousands of exhibits were filed, and an estimated 400 witnesses were called during the trial.



Photo by Michael Clapp

Workers watch as the electric-blue tarp is stripped from the Science I building Tuesday. The covering was put in place to keep asbestos particles from escaping as workers removed the substance from the exterior of the building.

'Yummie' rebels unite but cause is uncertain

By Stasia Scarborough

Of the Emerald

With a name like Yummies, it's difficult to imagine that this is a group of people with some pretty gloomy predictions.

But they are also a political group that is not without hope for the future — and that's why they've organized. Sort of.

The Yummies, holding their "second official" but first real public meeting Tuesday night, discussed just what their goals and philosophy should be. But like many open political discussions, just about every point remained unresolved after discussion.

John Fike, one of the Yummie founders, said the group would call itself "left-wing, yet all-encompassing."

"We definitely don't want to label ourselves," Fike said.

But later, during the group's discussion on whether they would like to have a particular political affiliation, a large group of the some 20 persons in at-

tendance said they didn't want any type of label, including Fike's suggestion.

Born in the emotion of election night, the Yummies were started by five students who said they want to re-educate the student population to the realities of the modern world. The democratic process and the state of modern society, they said, are not in the best of shape.

Their audience goal is a big one: they would like to re-educate the students who voted for the current Republican ticket, and to motivate those students who are not yet actively interested in the world around them, Fike said.

The group has declared a hatred for U.S. intervention in Nicaragua, what they call the foolishness of current defense and military policy, and investment in South Africa, "a country promoting modern-day slavery," Fike said.

They have gone so far as to

Continued on Page 8A

Project was a 'no choice' issue

By Paul Ertelt

Of the Emerald

He was a young graduate student working with the greatest scientific minds of the time to develop the most destructive weapon yet known to man.

"It was an unbelievable, wonderful experience in a terrible, terrible atmosphere," University President Paul Olum said Tuesday of his experience with the Manhattan Project that developed the first atomic weapon.

More than 250 people gathered at the Eugene Community Conference Center to hear the University Forum lecture sponsored by the

'It was an unbelievable, wonderful experience in a terrible, terrible atmosphere.'

— Paul Olum

University's Center for the Humanities, the Failing Lecture Fund, the National Endowment for the Humanities and the City of Eugene.

Olum discussed the research in physics that made nuclear fission possible, recounting the discoveries of pioneering physicists such as Ernest Rutherford, Niels Bohr, and Enrico Fermi.

Albert Einstein was one of the first to realize the implications of this new knowledge, Olum said. In October, 1939, Einstein wrote to President Franklin Roosevelt warning him that if the United States did not begin work on an atomic bomb, Nazi Germany might develop the weapon first.

So in October, 1941, systematic work began on the bomb. "The first office happened to be in Manhattan," Olum said, but work was carried out

throughout the United States.

Olum said the nuclear age really began when Fermi produced the first self-sustaining nuclear chain reaction in a Chicago laboratory in December, 1942. Prof. Aaron Novick, director of the University's Institute of Molecular Biology, assisted on that project.

In April, 1943, Olum went to Los Alamos, N.M., and became part of "the greatest gathering of scientists ever," which included Fermi, Bohr, J. Robert Oppenheimer and Edward Teller.

Although he is concerned about the implications of the project and is today an avid supporter of the nuclear freeze movement, he and the other scientists on the project believed the work was necessary in order to win the war and save American lives.

"I felt then, and in retrospect I feel today, we had no choice but to work on it," he said.

But even at the time, Olum opposed the use of the bomb on a populated area, recommending first a demonstration detonation, followed by an ultimatum demanding a Japanese surrender. That idea was rejected and on August 6, 1945, the first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima. Three days later, a second bomb was dropped on Nagasaki, Japan.

"That was an unconscionable thing," Olum said. "They should have given the Japanese more time. They did not have to drop a bomb on Nagasaki and kill tens of thousands of people."

Olum said we now have the capability of destroying all life on earth with nuclear weapons. Yet we have a president who has opposed every nuclear arms limitation treaty produced by his predecessors, he added.

A nuclear freeze is a required first step in removing the threat of nuclear destruction from the earth, he said.