

Oregon Daily EMERALD

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published five days a week during the school year, except during examinations and vacation periods, by the Student Publications Board of the University of Oregon. Entered as second class matter at the post office, Eugene, Ore. Subscription: \$5 per school year, \$2 per term.

BILL MAINWARING, Editor
MARCIA MAUNEY, Editorial Page Editor
JACK WILSON, Sports Editor
EDITORIAL BOARD: Bill Mainwaring, Marcia Mauney, Sally Jo Greig, Sam Vahey, Chuck Mitchelmore, Cornelia Fogle, Jack Wilson, Al Johnson
Chief Make-up Editor: Al Johnson
Ass't News Editor: Cay Mundorff, Joan Dennis, Nancy Castle, Evelyn Olsen, Nancy Ferguson
Feature Editor: Phil Hager
Opinions expressed on the editorial page are those of The Emerald and do not pretend to represent the opinion of the ASUO or the University. Unsigned editorials are written by the editor; initialed editorials by members of the editorial board.
KEN NIEHANS, Business Manager
CHUCK MITCHELMORE, Managing Editor
DOROTHY BARKER, Adv. Mgr.
SALLY JO GREIG, Associate Editor
CORNELIA FOGLE, News Editor
GLEN GRAVES, Ass't. Adv. Mgr.
CHARMION FORD, Office Manager
Women's Editor: Dorothy West
Nat'l Adv. Mgr.: Jo Anne Milligan
Classified Adv. Mgr.: Arlene Krauss
Photo Editor: Nathan Bull
Ad Make-up Editor: Warren Rucker
Circulation Mgr.: Sam Vahey
Asst. Sports Editors: Jerry Ramsey, Tom Chapman
Executive Secretary: Pat Holley
Copy Desk Chief: Wayne Woodman.

We Cast Our Vote for Lynch

Two candidates seek your vote Wednesday for ASUO President.

One is a sincere and likeable fellow of average ability with only a very superficial knowledge of what student government is all about. The other is also sincere and honest, and in addition is extremely intelligent and has proved himself an outstanding leader and administrator. The Emerald editorial board unanimously endorses the latter, Jim Lynch, in his contest for the ASUO presidency against Donald Kalberer.

In endorsing Lynch we do not subscribe to the popular notion that Kalberer is nothing but a mouthpiece for his supporters — Dahlgren, Fedeley, Boyet, Alexander et al. Kalberer has a strong personality and sincerely believes he would call the shots, if elected. But, unless we vastly underrate him, he would need somebody's help to conduct his office, for he doesn't "know" student government and has not the superior intelligence which would be necessary to overcome this handicap.

But The Emerald's endorsement of Lynch is not based primarily upon his opponent's lack of qualification for the office. We believe that Lynch is the best qualified possible candidate in the whole student body, and that he will be one of the University's most outstanding ASUO Presidents in many years.

He is extremely capable. He thinks well on his feet. He is not a smooth orator, but his sincerity and clearness of thought and general manner make a very favorable impression. He, like Kalberer, has definite ideas about a lot of things student government could and should be doing. He also knows how to go about it, and would have the respect of those he would have to work with.

Knowing that their candidate is relatively weak, the Oregon Student Party strategists would like voters to look past the candidates and evaluate only the platforms. OSP has a good platform — we argue only with its planks on fraternity discrimination and perhaps with abolition of segregated seating. Our objection to OSP is based largely upon its desire to renew the old and irrational Greek-Independent split. We also strongly object to the attitude of some of its leaders (not including Kalberer) that this election is merely a game to test the strategy learned in the political science department. The Emerald takes a more serious view of student government.

Both candidates believe that student government can and should be more effective and that the ASUO President must take strong and positive stands to assure this. Both believe that the Senate should be concerned with all problems of importance to students, not just those things which reach it automatically. Both candidates have stimulated thinking about the role of student government.

But although the ASUO President bears



the primary responsibility for effectiveness of student government, he cannot do the job alone. He needs a Senate of men and women genuinely interested rather than motivated by the positions' prestige, possessed of intelligence and common sense and the courage to ask questions and take strong positions on issues as they arise.

Some of the candidates, especially those for underclass offices, members of The Emerald editorial board do not know well enough to endorse. But we do feel that the following candidates deserve election:

For Senator-at-large: Dick Allen, Larry Brice, Dorothy Gamblin, Harry Hanna, Marsha Meyers, Rob Roy, Dick Shaw, Helen Simon, Howard Timmons and Bud Titus.

For class offices: Cornelia Fogle and Sue Ryder, senior class representative; Walt Schreck, junior class president; Sue Helfrecht, junior class representative, and Diana Scott, sophomore class representative. In other contests we feel unqualified to endorse.

* * *

Although the decision to support Lynch appeared obvious to us, it is only the opinion of seven persons. The election outcome should represent the informed opinion of most of our 6,000 students. If you are still undecided about whom to vote for on Wednesday, we urge you to attend the Student Union coffee hour to be held this afternoon. Seeing and evaluating the candidates for yourself is the surest way to make democracy work best in student government.

Footnotes

And what's the appropriate comment after the original "Lost Weekend" — Duck Preview? It might be "Sigh!" or "Base!" (we saw the Vodvil, too) or "Gee" or "Wow!" But this sounds all too final. Our suggestion: "Junior Week, Junior Prom, Mothers' Weekend, All-Campus Sing, Canoe Fete, track meets, baseball, river, beach, sunshine, finals and commencement." 'Nuff said?

Pig Pot Sure Thing



Letters to the Editor

Emerald Editor:

Today's paper should carry the Emerald Editor's endorsement of ASUO candidates. Friday's paper carried an editorial by the Editor explaining at length the fact that endorsement resulted, in large part, from an impartial interview.

The stated purpose of that editorial was to inform voters of the method by which the endorsement was determined upon so readers will "have some way of evaluating its importance."

This was a poor time and a poor year for the Editor to deliver a sermon on the probity of Emerald endorsements. The Editor himself has worked strenuously to reduce the chances of election of one candidate.

This was done before the closed-session interview upon which such importance is allegedly placed.

Don't misunderstand me. Editorial endorsement is proper and desirable. It should be based upon judgment grounded in fact. But an Editor should not preach upon the interview as a fair method of making a decision when he has already decided to support one candidate and stop the other.

Edward N. Fedeley
 Third Year Law Student

Editor's Note:

As Mr. Fedeley has been told, the editor was invited to attend a meeting, the purpose of which was to eliminate three candidates. This was done by means of an all-living organization poll, in contrast to the "smoke-filled room" method of the opposing group. It was done to assure majority election of the ASUO President. Mr. Fedeley, by his actions and attitude, apparently favors minority election.

Emerald endorsement is based on the candidate's brains and ability, character, ability to best represent the student body, and positions on various issues. The interview is very valuable in evaluating the candidates, but Emerald editorial board members do not wear blindfolds the other 364 days of the year. Our selection of Jim Lynch is the unanimous view of seven members of the editorial board, which includes four Greeks and three independents.

Emerald Editor:

Friday morning, campaign literature was distributed to University classrooms by the Oregon Students' party. This literature carried a quotation from one of my recent Emerald columns, in which I decried any form of Greek-Independent alignment in campus politics and social events.

In order to clear up any misunderstanding resulting from this use of my words: I do not support to any degree whatsoever, the OSP party. I will vote for some of its candidates as qualified individuals and I am in sympathy with part of its platform (not, however, the parts concerning discrimination clauses and segregated seating at athletic events.) I repeat, however, that I do not support the party as such.

The OSP charged that the withdrawal of three candidates from the presidency race was a direct move to bring about a Greek-Independent split. This is completely false. I am an "independent," and I am energetically supporting Jim Lynch for ASUO president. Furthermore, I know many other fellow "independents" who are supporting Lynch.

The charge by the OSP was trumped up to convince the Independents that the Greeks were ganging up on them. This type of campaigning I deeply resent, because it attempts to aggravate Greek-Independent relations. It is an indirect contradiction of the very thing OSP was trying to say.

Fortunately, the student body of the University of Oregon is smart enough not to be swayed by this sensational, rabble-rousing type of campaign. In this respect, the OSP backers have under-rated the student electorate. The student body sees through, and detests these poorly-prepared charges, contrary to the good ethics of a student election.

I think this will be reflected in Wednesday's election by a general rejection of the OSP party.

Sam Vahey
 Senior in Business

Editor's Note:

OSP's campaign posters did not say in so many words that seven named Greek organizations were supporting them. (Continued on page 3)