

ASUO Senate Vacancies

In an Inadequate Constitution Process of Filling Vacancies Is One of Worst

For several years, the ASUO Senate has been filling its own vacancies. This practice deserves some serious questioning.

When an ASUO Senator resigns or is disqualified for academic reasons, the Senate calls for petitions to fill the space. Those who petition are narrowed down to three by the six-member student government committee, a standing committee of the Senate. Then the Senate spends about five minutes interviewing each of the three candidates, and elects the new officer.

Several obvious faults are built into this system. In the first place, any shortcomings the present Senate possesses are compounded by the selection of members who agree with the present Senate. Any possibilities for dissent are automatically lessened because of this method.

There is also a tendency for the Senate to play political games with the open positions. Fraternities with five or six members on the Senate have a pretty good chance to get another frat brother on it, for instance.

These problems were pointed out for all to see at the last Senate meeting when there was considerable debate as to whether or not the new Senator should be selected before or after the vote on NSA. It was decided he would be selected before

the vote. Then, after being selected, he proceeded to give a 20-minute presentation against NSA.

But even more apparent than these practical objections, is the lack of a democratic basis for this practice. Why should freshmen be on a committee which narrows down candidates for upper-class women's dormitory representative? Why should sophomore ASUO Senators vote for the graduate representative?

We would like to suggest that the ASUO Senate, in revising the ASUO constitution as it has said it is going to do, should consider recommending to the student body changes in this process of filling Senate vacancies.

Perhaps the runner-up in elections could automatically fill all vacancies. This would be more democratic, more representative. Or maybe the Senate should even consider the idea of leaving vacancies open, with the exception of the class presidencies and ASUO president and vice president. This would put more of a premium on the selection of members who are likely to last an entire year.

In an ASUO constitution which is riddled with loopholes, inefficiencies and inadequacies, the present process of filling vacancies is one of the worst.

A Misunderstood Stand

We are somewhat disappointed with the degree to which our editorial stand on the possible appearance of Harry Bridges on this campus has been misinterpreted, as evidenced by recent letters to the editor.

We do not stand against inviting controversial speakers to the University, and will support the right of Harry Bridges or anyone else to speak on this campus. We would like to see more such speakers come here.

These feelings do not, however, change the reality of dollars and cents, as related to this legislative year.

We detest the, "Don't rock the boat" attitude prevalent every legislative year as much as anyone else. But it is also our belief that the way to change such an attitude is not to fly in the face of it whenever possible.



"YOU'RE PLAYING MY SONG."

Letters to the Editor

Shocked Reader

Emerald Editor:

Having read your Tuesday, Jan. 22, issue of the Emerald, I must admit to a great feeling of shock and outrage.

I feel shock at your editorial entitled "A Rebuttal" and outrage at the editorial entitled "Another Greek Exemption."

Why should I be shocked at the article you entitled "The Rebuttal?" First, let me quote a few sentences you have written. You have stated that "our (The Emerald) job is to report the news." This may be your job but, if so, you certainly are not reporting it very well. You have not reported any favorable news about the Greek system this entire school year. I would classify this as news—why aren't you covering it? This point ties in with a second quote "We would gladly have reported something constructive about fraternities," well, the fact is, you will not. I will point out three constructive things done by fraternities, one of which was covered in the back pages of an issue, but the other two completely ignored. The item that was covered was the holding of Christmas parties for underprivileged children that at least two fraternities on campus held. I might add that if the fraternities had not handed in the articles the Emerald staff would never have dug them out, being too busy covering smut concerning the Greeks. Now, as to the other two items that received no mention at all. One, a number of fraternities and sororities have been donating money to a professor in our history department, to send a Japanese student through medical school. The money raised has been enough to cover a year's expenses for the student. This has been going on for a number of years and, as far as I can tell, has not been mentioned once. But, perhaps you don't feel that this is constructive. Second, a fraternity volunteered a morning's work to the University in helping clean up branches and other debris that the wind storm left on the campus. Again, no mention in the newspaper that is supposed to be covering the activities of our school. So here I have mentioned three constructive things that fraternities have done, one receiving little mention and the other two none at all. And yet you say you "report the news" and will gladly report something constructive about fraternities. You say you won't report "only good news," well, why don't you try to report something other than the bad news?

Regarding the other half of your editorial "Another Greek Exemption," I have never seen

such colored journalism in my life. You used every dirty trick you could use. Is it fair journalism to refer to the sorority girl as "Mollie Mudd?" Why didn't you use the names "Mollie the bad nasty rotten apple" and "Jane the all American college girl"? You could have achieved your objective, putting sororities in a bad light, even better. Then you go on to represent the sorority girl as a student just barely making it through college, a 2.001 GPA, and the non-sorority girl as the straight and narrow 4.000 student. If you would check the grade list I'm sure you will find that this is not the case. You certainly weren't kidding when you said you "slightly over-exaggerated" the situation. But I just pick on small points here. Your major thesis seems to be that drinking is another of the double standards. What, pray tell, is your original double standard? I certainly can't see it.

If you want to write an editorial on drinking you should at least sit down and think it out. You state that the sorority girl gets away with coming home drunk, and that no upper-class women in dormitories get away with coming in with so much as the faint scent of one drink on their breath. That statement is so ridiculous that it hardly rates consideration. If you feel that the statement is the truth then I feel that you have been cooped up in your office too long and it is about time you started getting around campus a little.

I would like to ask one final (Continued on page 3)

Letters to the Editor

On Fraternities

Emerald Editor:

For quite some time fraternities have been subjected to various "morality movements". Why it is that Greek organizations are singled out as particularly sinful? Perhaps too few people are aware of the Greek side of the picture. I am speaking from the viewpoint of an individual fraternity member—not for all fraternities.

Fraternities are not "anti" anyone. It is simply that many national organizations were founded on the belief that closest brotherhood comes when those of the group are of the same ethnic origin. This may not be each member's personal belief. However, being a national organization, Brothers of the Oregon chapter must be acceptable to any other Brother in another part of the country, as well as to those who have preceded us. This is respect, if nothing else. A person who cannot accept these circumstances should not become a member of such a national organization.

Rather, he should seek a group with convictions similar to his, or form a group of his own. Possibly this could be the role of local fraternities on our campus, for presently the co-ops are the only other living organizations founded on the concept of brotherhood.

Certainly, no one can be justified in forcing another person to believe as he does, or even to create a situation under which it is impossible for an individual

or a group to hold the ideals they see fit. I understand the University Administration's policy is to guarantee each U of O. fraternity chapter the freedom to pledge whoever they wish. I respect and appreciate their concern, but I also respect the beliefs of my fraternity. A waiver is one way to solve the problem. It grants an individual chapter freedom to pledge as it wishes, but is given with the trust that the chapter still believes as the rest of the chapters do. Is the NAACP trying to deprive us of the right to preserve our integrity?

It might be well to clarify several points. Fraternities receive no financial aid from the University or the taxpayers of Oregon. Persons who join a Greek organization do so voluntarily. Fraternities are therefore independent, private groups.

It is my opinion that the impetus and responsibility for making any necessary changes should come from within each private organization. I challenge the IFC and the President's Council to meet the issue squarely, and I ask non-Greeks to recognize our rights.

Laurence Arnold
Junior in Architecture

Closing Their Ears

Emerald Editor:

I was surprised to see so few professors at the lecture Thursday given by Robert S. Summers. Professor Summers' "Last Lecture" was devoted to attack-

ing the method of teaching used by most University professors. I wonder why the professors did not have time to hear their "spoon-feeding" lecture method criticized. If their method is correct, why were they not present to defend or attack? Are our professors that sure that a spoon in the student's mouth is the correct way to teach?

Lee E. Harrell
First Year Law

Oldest Profession

Emerald Editor:

If any male wants empirical evidence that girls really are illogical and confused, he has only to observe the coming "Women's Week". The theme of the week is "Gay Nineties", supposedly celebrating the accomplishments of the turn-of-the-century feminist movement. Susan B. Anthony! Elizabeth Cady Stanton! Freedom! Equality! Independence! Hurray!

That is, until one looks at the last, and probably best-attended function of Women's Week—the pledge auction. Apparently the women of this University are not as grateful to the Anthonys and Stantons of the nineties as they would have us believe, for at the auction the girls do as women have done, in one way or another, for thousands of years—they sell themselves to men.

Bobbie Stanley
Sophomore in Anthropology
Carole McMann
Sophomore in English

OREGON DAILY EMERALD

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published seven 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 opinions of the ASUO or the University.

RON BUEL, Editor
MARTY KETELS, Business Manager
TED MAHAR, Managing Editor
EVERETTE DENNIS, News Editor
PHIL COGSWELL, Editorial Page Editor
LARRY WILLIAMS, Advertising Manager
LARRY GRAVES, Sports Editor
DULCY MORAN, Assistant Managing Editor
DAVE SANDS, JIM FRAKE, JANET GOETZE, Assistant News Editors
GEORGE BIGHAM, Photo Editor
LINDA BROWN, Entertainment Editor
RON COWAN, CATHY NEVILLE, THORA WILLIAMS, Associate News Editor
EDITORIAL BOARD:
Ron Buel, Phil Cogswell, Ted Mahar, Everett Dennis, Dave Sands, Lucy Moran, Linda Brown, Bob Forsyth, Grant Ledgerwood, Doris Ragen, Janet Goetze, and Bill H. Ichison