## Commentary

**OREGON DAILY EMERALD** 

Friday, November 4, 2005

#### **NEWS STAFF**

PARKER HOWELL SHADRA BEESLEY MEGHANN M. CUNIFF

EVA SYLWESTER KELLY BROWN KATY GACNON CHRISTOPHER HAGAN BRITTNI MCCLENAHAN NICHOLAS WILBUR

JOE BAILEY **EMILY SMITH** SHAWN MILLER SCOTT LADAMS

LUKE ANDREWS JEFFREY DRANSFELDT AMY LICHTY

TREVOR DAVIS KRISTEN GERHARD ANDREW MCCOLLUM AILEE SLATER GABE BRADLEY JESSICA DERLETH ARMY FETH

тім вовоѕку NICOLE BARKER KATE HORTON KATIE GLEASON

JONAH SCHROGIN IOHN AYRES JONNY BAGGS MOLLY BEDFORD KERI SPANGLER

CHRIS TODD AARON DUCHATEAU

DAWN HELZER REBECCA TAYLOR JENNY DORNER BRYN JANSSON JOSH NORRIS JENNA ROHRBACHER MATT TIFFANY

STEVEN NEUMAN TIMOTHY ROBINSON

#### BUSINESS

JUDY RIEDL KATHY CARBONE LAUNA DE GIUSTI

LUKE BELLOTTI RYAN JOHNSON RANDY RYMER CORRIEN MUNDY

#### **ADVERTISING**

MELISSA GUST MIA LEIDELMEYER KELLEE KAUFTHEIL JOHN KELLY LINDSEY FERGUSON WINTER GIBBS KATE HIRONAKA

**DESI MCCORMICK** STEPHEN MILLER KATHRYN O'SHEA-EVANS CODY WILSON

BONA LEE

#### CLASSIFIED

TRINA SHANAMAN LISA CLARK AMANDA KANTOR KERI SPANGLER KATIE STRINGER

#### **PRODUCTION**

(541) 346-4381 MICHELE ROSS

KIRA PARK PRODUC ERIN MCKENZIE IONAH SCHROGIN

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published daily Monday through Friday during the school year by the Oregon Daily Emerald Publishing Co. Inc., at the University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore. The Emerald operates independently of the University with offices in Sulford Sulford Common Com

#### ■ In my opinion

### Media: Cut the SCARE TACTICS

that Americans have to worry about: terrorists, West Nile virus, Norwalk virus, floods, mad cow disease, tsunamis, meteors, earthquakes, cholesterol. It seems as though we are all doomed; one thing or another is determined to wipe us off the planet.

The media is always covering some new sensational threat that, up until now, we have all managed to be completely ignorant about. Every time the media covers some new report, some new threat, people panic.

That panic is, to a certain extent, understandable. When virtually every newspaper and news report is full of grave statistics and expert testimony, it is reasonable that a viewer would begin to worry; after all, most of these disasters are possible. But these reports need to be taken with a grain of salt.

Take, for example, the possibility of a tsunami off of the Oregon Coast. Soon after the tsunami in Asia, people began to wonder whether such a catastrophe is possible elsewhere, especially in the United States. At this point, some sources were already warning about such a disaster occurring in Oregon. A reprinted article from the Register-Guard that appeared on oregongeology.com read: "At 9 p.m. Jan. 26, 1700, a magnitude 9.0 earthquake and accompanying tsunami hit the coast of Oregon. The size of the event and the kind of damage it caused, both near and far, were similar to that caused by Sunday's earthquake off Indonesia's Sumatra coast." The article goes on to explain that this type of disaster happens every 300 to 500 years. So, obviously, Oregonians should begin to prepare for a wall of rushing water.

Reports continued about how Oregon is not prepared for such an event and that towns and cities would be utterly devastated. Then, on Oct. 19, 2005, the NOAA National Weather Service accidentally issued a tsunami warning for parts of the Oregon Coast.



JESSICA DERLETH

This warning activated the state's emergency alert system as well as the panic button of many citizens. Police and fire agencies were flooded with phone calls. People had no idea what was happening or what to do.

I think that some of this panic can be attributed to the scare tactics that media were using prior to this incident. It is important that the government, cities, families and individuals are prepared for disasters, but the media often goes about things in the wrong way when it comes to encouraging preparation. Newspapers and news broadcasts sensationalize the problem. They talk about how devastating a disaster could be. They count the possible dead. They total the cost for the city and country. They then tell you that there is a 10 percent chance of this happening in the

I am not saying that this information shouldn't be reported on. It is very important that citizens, and the government, think about such possibilities and prepare for them. But newspapers shouldn't work to solve problems by scaring their readers. To a certain extent, that is what happened on the Oregon Coast, and all people did was panic. They thought that they were facing a tsunami equal to that in Asia. This scare tactic is certainly not exclusive to tsunamis. The same thing has been happening in regard to diseases and other disasters.

Recently there has been talk of massive earthquakes hitting Oregon. This theory of an earthquake is along the same lines of the tsunami; it has been 300 years and it is time for it to happen again. This report is very positive in that it focuses on what needs to be done and what preparations need to be made. It appears that several buildings on campus - Facilities Services, Riverfront Innovation Center, Prince Lucien Campbell, Straub, and McArthur Court - are very likely to suffer severe damage if a major earthquake occurs. It is good to know this information, to know that something needs to be done to improve these buildings.

It is rather alarming to see what a major earthquake can do to this school. And it is also worrisome to think about how people would react to an earthquake. Having grown up in Southern California, I have been doing earthquake drills - crawling under desks and standing in doorways since I was in pre-school. I have also been in some memorable earthquakes: Ones that woke me up in the middle of the night to the sound of the water splashing out of the aboveground pool. So, I do know how frightening earthquakes can be and how important it is to be prepared.

The media should examine these disaster possibilities and the readiness of the city, state, and nation. But newspapers and news shows need to show some journalistic integrity and refrain from using scare tactics. They shouldn't start out a segment by describing the ground shaking for minutes on end, 30 feet tsunamis, soil liquefying, dams failing, bridges collapsing and thousands stranded in shelters.

That is not good journalism; that is a scare tactic. I cannot say what drives journalists to present the news in this light. Maybe they are trying to entertain, or entice readers. I do not understand. I just know that it isn't good journalism.

jderleth@dailyemerald.com

#### ■ Guest commentary

## Using immoral tactics to force morality on others is hypocritical

In response to the Guest commentary by Carrie Freeman that attacked columnist Army Feth's decision to wear a fur coat ("Protecting animals is happier than selfishly wearing them," ODE, Nov. 2):

It's interesting that Freeman claims that Feth mischaracterized the Dalai Lama's peaceful Buddhist principles, when Freeman evidently has no problem with mischaracterizing raising farm animals as slavery or saying that humans are animals. Nor does she have any qualms stating that being compassionate and wearing fur are somehow mutually exclusive. Freeman associates farm animals with slavery, vet Freeman has no shame in using African Americans and stepping on their backs by associating what they suffered with the suffering of farm animals.

PETA recently apologized and pulled a bus tour that equated farm animals with slavery, after African Americans protested this comparison. (The fact that PETA tried the same tactic with Jews and the Holocaust, which met with similar protest, makes their most recent apology hollow). The objections and feelings of African Americans to this comparison evidently means nothing to the supposedly compassionate Freeman.

Freeman claims that animals raised on farms are raised in cramped cages and then electrocuted "up their butt" or gassed in a "primitive gas chamber" begs the question, what world is she living in? Fur farms have a certification program developed in conjunction with the American Veterinarian Medical Association and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Farms are certified by inspection by an independent veterinarian to verify compliance with these standards. Farms must be re-inspected and recertified every 3 years. About 95 percent of domestic mink production occurs on certified farms that meet industry standards and have passed veterinary inspection. Industry guidelines regarding euthanasia follow the recommendations of the 1986 American Veterinary Medical Association Panel on Euthanasia. The guidelines recommend the use of carbon monoxide or carbon dioxide bottled gas for mink and lethal injection for fox, which is

also used to put your dog or cat to sleep humanely. This information can easily be found at the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Web site.

Freeman claims animal lovers are compassionate, but that does not explain the millions of dollars in damages caused every year by animal rights terrorists. Ask Anna Wintour who has been attacked by these "compassionate" just how compassionate they really are. How many college research laboratories have been destroyed by these compassionate people? Why are two compassionate PETA employees facing multiple counts of animal cruelty in North Carolina? Forcing one's own morality on others is not compassionate.

Those who result to the use of lies, force and intimidation to achieve their ends do so because they can not achieve them through reason, truth, and morality. Freedom means freedom to choose whether to wear fur or not, without the use of lies, force, or intimidation.

James Mullen lives in Maryland

#### ■ Editorial

# Economic development no excuse for seizing land

tatives for overwhelmingly passing a bill today that would sanction state and local governments that use eminent domain for economic development. If the bill passes in the Senate, all federal funds designed to improve or grow the economies of those states or areas will be cut off for two years.

Eminent domain is the government's power to use private property for its own purposes without the owner's consent. The Fifth Amendment requires government to appropriate land for "public use" and give landowners just compensation.

Traditionally, the Supreme Court approved eminent domain for public projects like roads, airports and schools, and for revitalizing destitute areas, such as New York's Times Square.

But in a landmark decision this June, the Supreme Court ruled that the city of New London, Conn., could use state eminent domain law to force several homeowners to give up their property for commercial use. The city argued that forcing homeowners to sell land for business development would create more than 1,000 jobs and increase tax revenues, revitalizing the city. Nine petitioners sued the city, claiming economic development was not a valid "public use" of their land.

In a narrow 5-4 ruling, the Court interpreted "public use" to include economic purposes. The decision outraged property rights advocates and many non-profit groups who feared it would allow government to misuse eminent domain power.

We were disheartened by the ruling. Nearly any construction project can be construed to have economic benefits, such as creating jobs and attracting businesses. Although opponents assert that states, not the federal government, should regulate the use of eminent domain, the right to own property without the threat of seizure is a pillar of our nation. Allowing government to replace one business with a different one that might generate more tax revenue undermines the very idea of the American Dream.

We thus support the House's decision to pass HR 4128. It would not prohibit state and local governments from using eminent domain for legitimate projects, but it would make them carefully weigh the benefits of gaining land through eminent domain against losing federal money.

And governments will probably reconsider. According to an Oct. 31 Congressional Budget Office report, "implementing the bill would have no significant impact on the federal budget because most jurisdictions would not risk the economic development assistance they receive from the federal government.

The bill defines economic development as taking private property without the owner's conceit and transferring it to another private entity for "profit, or to increase tax revenue, tax base, employment, or general economic health." It specifically exempts "removing harmful uses of land" and acquiring private property for hospitals, military bases and other public facilities.

The bill also rightly prohibits the federal government from using eminent domain for economic development.

We hope the Senate will quickly act on companion legislation introduced by Sen. John Cornyn, R-Texas. Citizens who wish to protect the sanctity of their homes and livelihoods from undue government seizure should urge their senators to enact this necessary legislation.