

Questions remain on research-park plan

Throughout the 1970s, Oregon, and Eugene in particular, developed a reputation for being anti-business. Late-Gov. Tom McCall publicly stated his opposition to new businesses locating in the state, while the state Legislature developed one of the most stringent land-use programs in the country.

But with the statewide unemployment rate hovering around 10 percent, Oregonians have attempted to earnestly develop the state's industrial sector.

The proposed Riverfront Research Park, which is a joint effort by the University, the city of Eugene and local businesses, is one example of this effort.

Proponents of the park, which would be located on land adjacent to the Willamette River, argue that the facility will pump thousands of dollars into the Oregon economy, while creating hundreds of new jobs. They also say it will enhance the University's reputation as a leading national research facility.

This all may be true, but Eugeneans must strive to maintain control over the project.

In other towns, projects of this size have traditionally raised community excitement to such new heights that community leaders have bent over backwards to ensure the project's success. City councils conduct uninspired hearings, land-use bodies waive many of their rules, and it all happens so fast that potential opponents are given little time to organize.

We hope that the Eugene City Council and Mayor Brian Obie will consider all of the park's ramifications before they give it their full support. There are many questions to be considered.

What type of research will be conducted at the facility? Will it be classified or de-classified? Will the scientists at the facility conduct military research?

The University, which will lease to park developers about 80 percent of the facility's land, must place a stipulation in the lease outlawing any classified research.

A university should not be a branch office for the Department of Defense. We are not in the business of developing weapons. Similarly, no University land should be used for such research.

We hope that University President Paul Olum will fight for this stipulation in any lease, because once the land is leased out, we will have very little control over that land.

We must also ask: Who will have ultimate control for ensuring the community's safety in case of a major accident at the park? Will the park increase pollution levels in the Willamette River? If yes, then what will be the nature of the pollutants?

Eugene must attract new businesses. Anyone who has recently looked for work in Eugene knows this to be true.

When people are unemployed the tax base shrinks and the community cannot provide adequate services. But this does not mean that we should prostitute ourselves to any new business that offers to locate in our community. Instead, we must carefully examine the pluses and the minuses offered by any new business.

It is our hope that through a sincere effort on the part of all the actors in the park's development, Eugeneans will be allowed to examine the pluses and the minuses of the proposed research park. Until this happens no one should make a final decision on the park's fate.



WHAT WILL THE SIMPLIFIED SYSTEM MEAN TO YOU? : PART 1.

letters

Clarification

During this year I have been very pleased with the reporting of Mary Lichtenwalner on the Incidental Fee Committee and ASUO in general. However, I do not feel that Tuesday's (ODE, June 5) article on the Davis administration accurately reflected my opinions of that administration, and specifically the performance of John Dreeszen with regards to the Athletic Department budget.

While I agree that the ASUO Executive did not communicate as effectively with the IFC as I would have liked; the IFC did not communicate with the ASUO Executive as effectively as I would have liked either.

Furthermore, it was not John's unpreparedness that was a problem, but rather the IFC's unwillingness to explore the Athletic Department's budget in great detail. I do think the executive's lack of presence at many of the meetings hindered the process, but I also think it is important to present the whole picture in this case.

Lastly, when asked about the accomplishments of the ASUO Executive, I was comparing the Davis administration to the Hotchkiss administration — which is a difficult measure for any administration to measure up to because of the overwhelming accomplishments of the Hotchkiss administration.

I hope this clears up the situation.

Adam Apalategui
Incidental Fee Committee

Tragic date

As the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan enters its sixth year, it would be appropriate to remember another, earlier victim of Soviet aggression.

This June 14 marks the 44th anniversary of the Baltic Holocaust, the most tragic event in the history of the Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian people. On this date, in 1941, the Soviet Union began mass extermination and deportation of innocent men, women and children from these three previously independent nations.

During the night of June 13-14, Soviet secret police went from house to house and arrested entire families, herding them into railroad cattle cars bound for Soviet slave labor camps in Siberia. In Latvia alone, almost 16,000 people disappeared in one night. In the ensuing months, nearly 600,000 Baltic citizens — 10 percent of the Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian populations were eliminated.

Oblivious to international law, the Soviets brutally suppressed the Latvian people and annexed this once free and independent nation to the Soviet Union. To this day, the United States has never recognized this illegal occupation.

The tragedy of this event is compounded by the fact that its perpetrators have never been brought to justice, and their crimes continue to oppress the people of these Soviet-occupied countries even today.

Elita Hill

General Science/Psychology

Chances are

The Emerald begins its argument (ODE, May 24), against the recent Senate vote to renew domestic production of chemical weapons with the following misleading assertion, "Since the late 1920s, a vast majority of the world's countries have refrained from either the production or the use of chemical weapons." What the Emerald dutifully neglects to tell us is that Soviet Union is now the world's leading pro-

ducer and user of chemical weapons.

In the May 9 Register-Guard syndicated columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak reviewed a "presidential commission's report on the extent of Moscow's chemical war plans..." along with other findings on this subject published in a new book, "Soviet Military Supremacy."

Apparently, the Soviets have "14 chemical weapon production facilities 'operating at full capacity' (and eight biological warfare plants). The United States has none of either." Also, in addition to using chemical weapons against Afghan guerrillas, the Soviets may have "conducted lethal chemical and biological tests against men and women tied to stakes in target areas..."

Now for a few questions: Why, after watching the United States observe a 15-year moratorium in this area, do the Soviets continue producing these dastardly weapons? Furthermore, why do the Soviets who solemnly avow their abhorrence for chemical weapons drop them on hapless Afghan peasants?

Could it be that Soviet warmongers are contemplating first-use of chemical weapons in a European war, and therefore are hoping that the United States will continue to renounce the most effective deterrent to such usage — the ability to retaliate in kind?

Tom Visoky
Journalism

Bad impression

My sporadic reading of the letters to the editor of the Emerald gives me the frightful impression of having been transplanted to a backwater college town in the Bible Belt.

What is Eugene and the University coming to if religious zealots and right-wing extremists dominate the public arena? I am very concerned about the negative impression created by this bigotry on the thousands of students and guests in our community from around the world.

Hans Tschersich
Eugene

oregon daily emerald

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published Monday through Friday except during exam week and vacations by the Oregon Daily Emerald Publishing Co., at the University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon, 97403.

The Emerald operates independently of the University with offices on the third floor of the Erb Memorial Union and is a member of the Associated Press.

General Staff

Advertising Director: Susan Thelen
Production Manager: Russell Steele
Classified Advertising: Vince Adams
Assistant to the Publisher: Jean Ownbey

Advertising Sales: Laura Buckley, Tim Clevenger, Jennifer Fox, Michael Gray - Intern, Robin Joannides - Intern, Carlos Lamadrid - Intern, Marcia Leonard, Rick Martz, Nancy Nielsen, Brett Pickman, Laura Willoughby - Intern, David Wood.

Production: Kelly Cornyn, Stormi Dykes, Manuel Flores, Kathy Gallagher, Dean Guernsey, Jackson Haring, Susan Hawkins, Kirk Hirota, Grant Keltner, Rob Kraft, Ross Martin, Karin McKecher, Lauri Neely, Kelly Neff, Kara Oberst, Curt Penrod, Michele Ross, Alyson Simmons, Peg Solonika, Karen Stallwood, Colleen Tremaine, Hank Trotter, Mary VanCura.

Editor: Michele Matassa
Managing Editor: Mike Sims
News Editor: Michael Kulaga
Editorial Page Editor: Costas Christ, Dave Berns
Sports Editor: Brent De La Paz
Sidelines Editor: Sheila Landry
Friday Edition Editor: Kim Carlson
Entertainment Editor: Michael Duncan
Night Editor: Sheila Landry

Associate Editors

Administration: Jolayne Houtz
Higher Education: Scott McFetridge
Politics: Paul Ertelt
ASUO: Mary Lichtenwalner
Student Activities: Diana Elliott
Community: Cynthia Whitfield
Features: Lori Steinhauer

Reporters: Sean Axmaker, Kirsten Bolin, Michelle Brence, Robert Collias, Julie Freeman, Thomas Henderson, Robin Joannides, Allan Lazo, Adam Worcester.

Photographers: Dean Guernsey, Kirk Hirota, Jim Marks, Ross Martin, Karen Stallwood, Hank Trotter.

News and Editorial: 686-5511
Display Advertising and Business: 686-3712
Classified Advertising: 686-4343
Production: 686-4381
Circulation: 686-5511