



'Oh look, George, his first tiny protest demonstration steps . . .'

Voice of the People

# Study alternate routes

DEAR EDITOR: This letter comments on Jack Briggs' columns on the local conservationists' position with regard to the proposed I-182 route through the Yakima River delta and Columbia Point. Mr. Briggs approached the issue of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) and then backed away without explaining its significance.

NEPA has been described as our environmental Magna Carta. This legislation, sponsored by Senator Jackson, has also been called our "environmental full disclosure act".

The basic purpose of NEPA is to factor environmental concern into governmental planning and to assure protection for our environment in the final decisions on federal projects and programs.

Section 102C of NEPA decrees that "all agencies of the federal government shall include in every recommendation or report on proposals for legislation and other major federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, a detailed statement by the responsible official on:

- The environmental impact of the proposed action,
- Any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented,
- Alternatives to the proposed action,
- The relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and
- Any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented."

The response of federal agencies to NEPA has been mixed. Environmental impact statements have ranged from scholarly to superficial and self-serving. The U.S. Department of Transportation and the highway departments that prepare the impact statements on federally funded highways, such as I-182, have the poorest record.

After considerable prodding the Washington State Highway Department prepared an impact statement for I-182 that fell in the superficial and self-serving category. The main deficiency of this statement was that it did not seriously compare alternatives to the proposed action.

What alternatives should be considered? The Highway Department took the "Columbia Point or none" approach. A more reasonable approach, closer to the intent of NEPA, would be to consider the environmental impacts of the several corridors in the Lochner-Gray report and the variations within the Columbia Point corridor. If this were done, we could be assured that the Columbia Point route is the best in terms of economics and environmental factors. We don't know that now. The time to determine the environmentally best route is before the concrete is poured.

A scholarly and detailed impact statement for I-182 (and I-82) should thoroughly investigate the following aspects:

- What would be the social costs of the proposed highway? Smog-induced illness, noise, and social disruption related to the highway need to be discussed.
- How would the proposed highway affect the agricultural productivity of the Lower Yakima Valley? For example, would automobile generated smog significantly reduce fruit production or its quality?
- Would the proposed highway irreversibly destroy more productive agricultural land than can be justified on the basis of future food demands? This question is directed to the conflict between short-term uses and the long-term productivity of the Lower Yakima Valley.

The question should be asked: Is legal action the only way to encourage the Washington State Highway Department and the U.S. Department of Transportation to seriously consider the environmental and social impacts of the highways they propose to build? Hopefully the answer is no. Informed opinion indicates that court action is usually necessary. A more constructive approach would be the insistence by public officials, from city councilmen to senators and governors, on thorough, detailed, and unbiased environmental impact statements.

Finally, who should make decisions related to the allocations of our fixed (or diminishing) resources? I believe that these decisions must be basically public decisions and should not be made by any particular interest group, be it a Good Roads Association, a newspaper, a conservation group, or a governmental agency. We need the inputs of all these groups. Informed discussion, responsible lobbying, political action, and legal tests represent ways of determining the merits of conflicting views. Hopefully the best decision would evolve from this dialogue.

JOHN C. SHEPPARD, Richland

down on power, and until it is mandatory that everyone use them, you can't expect one to ride with a silencer and perhaps lose the race.

We also constantly hear that it is dangerous, but so is walking across the street today. We feel that we would rather be with our son in this sport than run the risk that he be lost to us through dope or other equally dangerous past-times.

In Europe motorcycle racing is held in such high esteem, that the riders are national heroes and paid a salary to race for their country. American racers certainly don't expect to be on the government payroll, but they will not have an easy time competing against the British and Europeans until the attitude of the Americans changes and they are given the support they deserve for the amount of effort, time and money they put into it.

MRS. W. E. (JOAN) RUSSELL, Mesa

Minimize government

The real successes in our country have been achieved by individuals and corporations. The American suburbs, a synonym for comfortable living, are a triumph of the private developer and builder. The quality of automobiles and domestic appliances produced in this country are other examples of excellence that derive from free enterprise. To put it another way, the free enterprise system releases a great creative force in society — the efforts of millions of individuals to promote their interests and to live their lives by their own economic values, not according to economic standards decreed by federal bureaucrats and theoreticians. The continued progress of our country, therefore, requires less government intervention in its economic life, not more. — Dillon, S.C. Herald

Opinions

This is the Herald's OPINION page. This editorial page offers the newspaper's own opinions on matters of current interest in the editorial columns. It is intended to welcome the opinions of readers in the Voice of the People columns. It publishes opinions of columnists and other writers elsewhere on this page. Unsigned letters will not be published. The Herald reserves the right to edit all letters.

Opinions

Opinions

Opinions

Opinions

Opinions

Opinions

Opinions

Opinions

S. I. Hayakawa, in Seattle Times

# Mentally ill don't complain

In physical illness, it is the suffering individual who complains. "I have difficulty breathing," he says, or, "I have a pain in my side," as he goes to the physician for treatment. The patient may or may not take the physician's advice, although he usually does. He is a free agent.

In the case of mental illness, however, it is not as a rule the ill person who complains, but his relatives or neighbors, who ask a court to refer the individual for psychiatric examination. The individual may be happy enough, although behaving in ways that trouble his associates. But if they can get a psychiatrist to diagnose the individual as "mentally ill," they can have him committed to a mental hospital for an indefinite term — even for the rest of his life.

It will do the individual no good to protest, "there's nothing wrong with me!" He has been classified as "mentally ill" and others take over the control of his life — of course, for his own good.

How do we talk about people who behave in strange or socially unacceptable ways or entertain bizarre ideas? It is one thing to say of such people that they are wicked or misguided or wrong. If they are wicked, perhaps they can be shown the harmful consequences of their behavior. If they are

misguided or wrong, perhaps they can be corrected. But to say they are "mentally ill" is to deny them the elementary human attribute of rationality. It is therefore to regard them and treat them as subhuman.

The contrast between how society treats physical and mental illness is visibly illustrated by what happens when a member of Jehovah's Witnesses is told that he requires an operation involving a blood transfusion. As many know, blood transfusions are forbidden for members of this sect. Even when physicians regard this prohibition as "crazy" they respect such a patient's wishes.

A patient, in having been classified as "physically ill" is given a credit for making what is to him a rational choice within the framework of his beliefs and values.

No such respect for the patient's rationalities is shown to the person who is diagnosed as "mentally ill." As Dr. Thomas Szasz, professor of psychiatry at the State University of New York Upstate Medical Center in Syracuse writes: "There are two basic ways in which a person may be penalized in our present society. One is by running afoul of the law. The other is by running afoul of psychiatrists."

Law sets forth fairly clear

rules and penalties governing legal and illegal behavior. But there are no such clearcut standards for normal and deviant behavior. What is normal in the U.S. may be deviant in Japan; what is normal in San Francisco may be (and often is) outrageous in Freeport, Illinois.

But once a psychiatrist has declared a person "mentally ill," he can be subject to commitment in a way that is in total violation of his civil liberties. As Dr. Szasz continues, thus the patient has no counter-diagnostician "comparable to the defense attorney" . . . and the patient finds himself in legal jeopardy without having broken the law or being accused of a crime, and without having been tried and convicted." Having been defined as incapable of reason, he cannot argue his way out.

The American Association for the Abolition of Involuntary Mental Hospitalization, led by Dr. Szasz, the psychologist Erving Goffman, and Dean George Alexander of the school of law, University of Santa Clara, held its first organizational meeting in Syracuse on October 2. Its purposes first are to distinguish sharply between voluntary and involuntary hospitalization; and secondly to promote an understanding of the dehumanizing effects . . . of involuntary mental

hospitalization . . . and to promote . . . legislative and judicial actions making such involuntary psychiatric intervention unlawful."

Essentially it is an organization dedicated to securing for those accused of "mental illness" the same elementary rights enjoyed by those accused of breaking the law.

Dr. Szasz declares himself "wholly in favor" of voluntary hospitalization, which he compares to going to the church of one's choice.

"At this moment," Dr. Szasz writes, "thousands of American citizens are being forced to submit to psychiatric "therapies" against their will: to loss of liberty, to lifelong stigmatizations, to extremely toxic drugs, to brain-damaging effects of electric shock, and until recently even to such incredible barbarities as lobotomy. I submit that this is anything less than a crime to humanity."

Maggie Scarf in a recent New York Times Magazine article quotes a critic of Dr. Szasz' latest book, "The Manufacture of Madness," as saying, "there is something in it to offend practically everybody." Clearly, anyone who can offend almost anybody is brilliant and original thinker. I don't think Dr. Szasz's theories can be ignored.

Mike Royko, in Chicago Daily News

# That's some strong milk in Chicago

This being the 100th year since the Chicago fire, it figures that some smart guy would come up with a "new" version of how it began.

So the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry is trying to put the blame on Dennis (Peg Leg) Sullivan, a one-legged neighbor of the O'Learys.

They say that Sullivan went sneaking into the O'Leary barn to have a few furtive drinks.

Then he tried to light his pipe and that touched off the fire.

This is nonsense on the face of it. In the first place, why should a fully grown Irishman bother to sneak into somebody else's barn to drink?

They suggest that he might have enjoyed the smell of hay. Whoever said that has never been in a barn with six cows, which the O'Leary barn contained.

In the second place, a broken lamp was later found in the burned-out barn. If Sullivan was in the habit of sneaking into barns to drink, he wouldn't advertise his presence with a lantern.

The commerce and industry people should be ashamed of themselves. Sullivan was a hero. He happened to be outside, saw the fire and awakened the O'Learys.

That's the trouble with most of the theories about the fire. The wrong people get the blame.

First, it was Mrs. O'Leary. She and her cow are still considered the cause of it. Yet an investigation after the fire established that she was in bed when it began. She had a sore foot. One of her neighbors, a Mrs. Rogen, had stopped by about 8:30 and said something like:

"Catherine, why are you in bed so early?"

And she said:

"Because I have a sore foot."

So Mrs. Rogen said good night to Mrs. O'Leary and

her husband, who was also in bed, and went home.

Even if she didn't have a sore foot, she might have been in bed anyway, the poor woman. Every day she had to milk her six cows, then go around the neighborhood selling the milk. And then she would feed the cows and the family's horse. I've never figured out why her husband was in bed that early, since she did most of the work.

Instead of picking on Mrs. O'Leary and Peg Leg Sullivan, it is about time somebody places the blame where it belongs—on one of the drunken McLaughlins.

They were a family that lived in the same house as the O'Learys, but at the other end.

On the night of the fire, they were having a party, with a fiddler and everything.

They were celebrating the arrival from Ireland of one of their cousins.

And from what some of the neighbors said after the fire, it is pretty certain that one of the McLaughlins burned most of Chicago down.

Mrs. McLaughlin denied everything, of course. But her denial itself confirms many of the suspicions.

She insisted that the party was over by the time the fire started and that everybody had gone to bed.

Nobody believed that because some neighbors heard a fiddle playing about

the time the fire started and it is difficult to play a fiddle on your back, under a blanket.

It is also hard to believe that the celebration of an important event as the arrival of a cousin from Ireland would end before 9 p.m. or even 9 a.m.

The word around the neighborhood was that somebody at the McLaughlin's party was either making oyster stew or a whisky-milk punch. I lean toward the punch theory, although Mrs. O'Leary heard it was oyster stew.

A Mrs. White, who lived down the street, said she even saw one of the McLaughlins heading toward the barn, presumably to get the mix for the punch.

We can only guess what happened in the barn.

Removing milk from a cow takes a certain touch. And it is unlikely that a person who has been drinking and listening to fiddle music all evening would have this touch.

Maybe the cow, offended by a heavy hand, kicked out. Or maybe the man got his milk and staggered off, leaving the lantern behind.

In either case, that's what they were saying in the neighborhood after the fire and if you can't believe neighborhood gossip, what can you believe?

Yet most people have never

heard of the McLaughlins. If you went to a Chicago school, you were taught that the fire was caused by a dumb cow.

Our teachers are too timid to tell children that one of the biggest fires in history was probably started by somebody who was loaded to the gills.

They should tell the truth. Kids ought to know how dangerous it is to switch from whisky to milk.

## New taxes

### no answer

Whether our authorities like it or not — when will our legislators and governors listen to the pleas of the people. New taxes are not the answer. Less bureaucracy in state and national government. Less departments and especially less commissions and appointive offices. Right now the taxpayer wonders where the next payment will come from. Such treatment is the cause of all our troubles. When you force people to the limit, nothing is left but bankruptcy or rebellion. The people have a right to call a halt to waste — and departmental padding, waste and senseless departments is not the answer. The people do not desire more services — not in many a category of government.—White Salmon Enterprise

## Plant odor is horrible

DEAR EDITOR: I realize that we do need a potato processing plant in the Tri-City area. I also realize that it provides badly needed jobs for the local residents.

Isn't there some way to stop the stench that greets us every night after dinner just as we sit down to rest . . . then again about 11 p.m. just as we retire for the night.

It has been a long hot summer with the windows all shut so the air-conditioners could function. Now when we could enjoy some nice, sweet, fresh air we have to put up with this horrible smell.

If Richland allows a plant to be built in their area they are living in a dream world. They will have a rose bowl on both sides of town. NORENE RYDER, Pasco

*Kennewick First Lutheran Church*

Hiway 14 & Yelm

Pastors, Norris Halvorson, and Daryl Daugs

"Welcome"

Worship Services . . . 8:00, 9:30 & 11:00 a.m.

Sunday School . . . . . 9:30 a.m.

Nursery . . . . . 9:30 & 11:00 a.m.