

The Amendment

Students will vote on a proposed amendment to the ASUO Constitution tomorrow. The amendment would make several changes in the system of elections now used to select the student body president, vice president and members of the ASUO Senate. Because of the controversy regarding what the amendment is and is not, we have here listed the major arguments, explaining as explicitly as space limits will allow, just what the amendment would do if adopted and why it should be adopted.

- The amendment is not a proposal for a whole new system of election to take the place of the present preferential system. It would only change the preferential system by separating the elections of senators and representatives from student body and class presidents.

(In the present system candidates for student body president are listed alphabetically with candidates for senator at large. The only distinction made is the word "senator" or "president" in parentheses following the candidate's name. In this system a senatorial candidate could actually be elected president or—and this has happened—a presidential candidate could be elected senator. Under the terms of the amendment the two lists of candidates are separate, with presidential candidates listed again alphabetically under the senator heading. Defeated presidential candidates could thus be elected to the Senate, but senatorial hopefuls couldn't be elected president.)

(Class officer candidates wouldn't be listed separately according to the amendment, but if a presidential candidate were not elected president or vice president, he would be defeated and could not become a representative.)

- The amendment is not a re-emphasis of the so-called Greek-Independent split; it

changes the election system that was set up for this split into a system that does not include this formal division.

(An all-campus primary was held when there were two political parties—Greek and Independent—and there were then only two candidates for each office on the general election ballot. The primary was scrapped when the two formal parties dissolved. The general election system remained the same. The amendment brings this system up to date for today's situation when we have many parties and many candidates but no primary.)

- The amendment does not take away from the principle of minority representation on the ASUO Senate; it strengthens it.

(The ASUO preferential voting system is complicated. It is necessarily complicated because it attempts to provide for representation of minority groups of voters on the Senate. As the machinery is now set up—for use in an election where a primary has cut the candidates down to two for each office—this minority representation is made difficult. Candidates can run for president of the student body, and if defeated, have their presidential votes count for them as senator at large candidates. They may do the same thing in running for a class presidency, using their votes for class representative. The amendment makes this impossible through the separate listings, as shown in point one.)

The amendment, then, is an aid to our present election system which will make it fairer to candidates and voters alike. We fail to see that it is undemocratic or that it limits representation to a more "elite" group. The amendment is vitally needed clarification and has failed three times only because too few people voted in the election. It definitely deserves a "yes" vote.

+ + +

Revolving Game

The people at Corvallis have come up with some new moves in this silly little game of "getting even." Oregon State's Charlie Dunn, student body president, feels that our brief "abduction" of three members of the Aggie Homecoming court has evened things up between the two schools, and possession of Oregon's own "O" is more or less a side issue.

Maybe so, Charlie, but let's not forget that 20 by 40 foot letter completely. It weighs a little too much to consider things balanced evenly at the moment, and we don't think you really have the right to say what should happen to OUR "O", even if things are, as you claim, even up.

You see, misquote or not, we're still going on those promises by your Dean Dan Poling (made even before we got to your Homecoming court) about setting the "O" aside and returning it "sometime next week" (which is now). And that, Charlie, is why we don't like your trying to bargain with something that isn't yours to use in bargaining. So why don't you just forget this "revolving" stuff with our "O", at least.

And it's not that we're lacking in faith in our team either. Our boy Jim Lynch proved that by throwing the "bicycle" challenge out to you earlier this season—even before your Beavers so suddenly stopped looking like the "PCC leaders" which deserve so much "faith," as you put it.

So we're not afraid of revolving trophies. Bring on your duck-billed platypuses (an idea of Roger Widness, your Barometer editor); they're both duck and beaver, so nobody should feel badly. Or reconsider your Homecoming court (we still think

you'd been better off on a really even-up swap; our letter is more appropriate to the dimensions of an Aggie queen).

But please, Charlie, don't waste our time with the ideas of revolving what you have no right to start revolving. Give us our "O" back and then we'll talk trophy and tradition.

Where Would We Be?

The "tempest in a teapot" which has developed over the proposed amendment to the ASUO Constitution (discussed above) can be traced directly to the vigilant efforts of one man—Wynn Dahlgren.

Wynn, who still delights in playing at student government, will speak this afternoon at a coffee hour to explain further his personal opposition to the amendment. From his position as organizer and main driving force of the Oregon Students Party, Wynn will attempt to show that the new preferential system is "unfair, undemocratic and unrepresentative." Presumably, he will propose another election system to replace the present one which gives minority groups (which largely constitute the OSP) the best chance of electing representatives to student government.

But where would we (and OSP members, who know only that Wynn doesn't like the amendment) be without Wynn. He has given campus politics color and realism usually found only in state and local elections. He has given us experience with genuine "political statements" that turn out, when examined, to be virtually meaningless. He has given the campus the distinction of having a "real" political boss.

Bribery 101



Letters to the Editor

Emerald Editor:

The "confused and chaotic thinking" that Bud Titus states was displayed in last Wednesday's column on the proposed constitutional amendment, were the considered opinions of a dozen or more students who met the previous Sunday to discuss the possibility of bringing order into ASUO election laws. This group included a past ASUO Vice-President and several law students.

We were unanimously of the opinion that the statement in the amendment—"Candidates for President shall be listed on a separate ballot. Their names shall also appear on the ballot for Senator at Large, in alphabetical order"—meant exactly that. In the copy of the amendment I received at the last Senate meeting, were the words "regular alphabetical order". The secretary said the printed copy was incorrect and before handing it to me, she crossed out the word "regular".

Where does the amendment state that the past practice of listing presidential and senatorial candidates in alphabetical order will continue to be followed?

Wednesday afternoon, Jim Lynch told me that the writers of the amendment intended to retain the present practice of listing all senatorial candidates alphabetically, but that the amendment's wording was confusing. If it is confusing to the ASUO President, I believe it would confuse most students.

To the casual reader, all this may seem unimportant, but, at some future date, what is to prevent senatorial ballots being printed with the presidential candidates listed in alphabetical order at the top of the ballot? Such preferred listing would go a long way to ensuring election of nine seniors for the at-large positions and greatly lessen the chances for sophomores, juniors, and women.

Presidential candidates and their platforms get the benefit of a great deal of free publicity, and I foresee a whole raft of smart senatorial candidates running for president.

Obviously, Mr. Titus, one vote on each ballot for the same person would be necessary to assure election of a presidential candidate to the senate. This double voting could cause confusion.

As to the majority system of

voting, I think it is time to call a spade a spade. For the 1500 or so members of the self-perpetuating elite group on this campus, voting is compulsory. I don't know how many people I noticed last spring who were rushing to vote so they could eat lunch.

In the greatest election turnout in U. of O. history, last May, 2750 ballots were cast. Of these about 150 were thrown out because they were incorrectly marked. Compulsory voting, with the use of the complicated majority preferential system, would effectively work to eliminate the chances for election as president, vice-president or senator-at-large, of anyone outside this self-perpetuating elite group.

My thinking may be "chaotic and confused" but my hallucinations are not so far advanced for me to believe that many number two votes would be cast by members of this group for someone outside this group.

The student senate lineup today stands 23 to 3, and the 3 were elected last spring only after a hard campaign. Over 3000 students in the dorms, Amazon, off-campus, etc., have no representation from their living groups. If I interpret the sentiment of the senate correctly, as expressed in their questions to candidates for the recent vacancy, and suggestion to change the election laws to give democratic representation to all U. of O. students, would be looked upon very unsympathetically.

Again I reiterate, this amendment does nothing to clear up the confusion about our complicated election system, and instead of extending democracy on the campus, would work to further restrict it.

Wynn Dahlgren
Graduate in Political Science

OREGON DAILY EMERALD

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

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.

CHARLES MITCHELMORE, Editor
GARY CAPPS, Business Manager
JACK WILSON, Editorial Page Editor
ALLEN JOHNSON, Managing Editor
GLEN GRAVES, Advertising Manager
CORNELIA FOGLE, WILLIAM COOK, Associate Editors
PHIL HAGER, News Editor
JERRY RAMSEY, Sports Editor