

Overhaul Needed

Updated Elections System Would Increase Participation

The traditional political disengagement of University students is re-emphasized each spring during ASUO elections. The lack of participation on the part of students is due primarily to an elections system which is biased toward the least competent voters—freshmen women.

The focal point of any criticism of the elections system is obviously the appalling lack of polling places. Only five polling places serve an enrollment of more than 8500. Some students have complained that they have waited as long as 30 minutes to vote in the spring student body election. Ironically one of the five polling places is the lobby of Carson Hall, which houses an insignificant 4 per cent of the University's population whose only contribution is to vote on the basis of emotional appeal.

A precinct system with an increased number of polling places proportional to the number of students in various living areas should be established. Specific designated polling areas for off-campus and fraternity residents at the west end of the campus as well as additional dormitory polling places in the Hamilton-Bean area are a long-overdue step forward in solving the problem. Additional areas with easy access to students are Deady Hall, the University Theatre area, and the library. Removing the polling place from Carson Hall will reduce much of the present criticism directed at the Elections Committee.

Polling places apportioned on a representative basis would at least organize campus elections on the basis of equal oppor-

tunity for persons of all residence designations. It might even promote the return of substantive issues in campus political campaigns. Over the past 15 years, the ASUO elections have shifted from a lively political party system pitting Greek against Independent to the popularity contest presently in vogue.

At the same time if student elections are to promote activism and interest for meaningful issues it will be necessary to omit the selection of junior weekend queens from the same ballot with ASUO officers. The changes suggested above are only a few needed to update the University's antiquated elections system. The present system was designed for a student body of less than 5000. It is time for the ASUO Elections Committee to recognize their responsibility to the student body and review the present system.

Other serious questions might be asked about the decadent ASUO elections system. Queries could include the need for secret balloting with voting booths and residence designations on student body cards to assure that only qualified voters participate in the vote for these races. If the Elections Committee begins plans for reform now, a realistic and representative system could be realized before spring elections.

University students deserve a fair and unbiased system. It is doubtful that the campus will swarm with vigorous activists overnight, but an improved system would provide an impetus for increased participation.

Recall—An Urgent Issue

A computer system would be necessary to assess all the shortcomings of the ASUO Constitution, but one fault which the Senate should consider immediately is recall. The campus political episode last week in which Foreign Student Representative Wolfgang Finkbeiner faced a revolt among his constituents revealed the serious lack in the constitution for any provision to recall or impeach officers.

Recall is a device whereby any elective officer may be removed from office by popular vote prior to the time his term expires. Such a provision is intended to permit removal of any officer who proves incompetent or shows a lack of sympathy with the needs of his constituents and is incorporated in both the Oregon and U. S. constitutions.

At present the ASUO Constitution gives students no means to remove a senator or any other officer regardless of how serious the reasons for impeachment or recall.

The important issue of the Finkbeiner controversy is not merely the representation of foreign students, but the rights of any students who feel they are not adequately represented and have no means of effectively showing opposition.

Paradoxically, the University is located in a state which was one of the first to adopt a recall provision in its Constitution. As

a state-supported school, the University should logically institute the realistic and democratic measure which Oregon has pioneered.

The essential point of recall procedure is the circulation of a petition requiring a sufficiently large percentage of signatures. After the signatures are compiled and certified, an election becomes obligatory.

Principal advantage of recall is that it would strengthen the responsibility of the official, making him more alert to the needs and problems of his constituents who would not have to wait in exasperation until the end of his term.

The question of the use of the recall is not popularly considered an urgent campus issue, but it does seem that this particular control device would be helpful in giving students the advantage of a fair chance at representation.

Footnote

"Married students who live in state-supported housing have a higher birth rate than those who live in privately-owned housing. They are creating a burden on the school districts."

Rep. C. R. Hoyt (R-Corvallis), speaking before the House Taxation Committee.



HITCHHIKER

Letters to the Editor

Double Standard

Emerald Editor:

I read with interest your editorial entitled, "UO—Friendly or No?", which appeared in the January 28 issue of the Emerald.

The survey conducted by Elias K. Zain on an "accidental sample" of 100 foreign students is interesting as well as revealing. The most important point is the fact that 80 out of the 100 students interviewed indicated that they knew American students who were friendly to them. This proves that the University of Oregon campus is quite a friendly place for the foreign student.

The survey further reveals that in the case of 52 students the professor had made adjustments in the courses to make things easier for them. This part of Mr. Zain's study is rather disturbing. Does it mean that these students had a low IQ or found American system of education difficult to follow or maybe they didn't like to work hard.

Of the 100 students in the "accident sample," 80 came from Asia. At this stage it will be interesting to note that a survey which I conducted last fall revealed that there were 448 foreign students on the campus. Of these 243 were from Asia, 181 from Europe, Canada, Mexico, South America, and 24 from Africa.

Since Asian students outnumber all other foreign students, it is quite probable that in another "accidental survey" if conducted, the majority of students will be from Asia. Does Mr. Zain's survey therefore reveal that Asian students in particular like their professors to make things easier for them? If so, this is an unhealthy sign and should be remedied at once.

One might also infer that these 52 students were scared of working hard and matching their performance with American students. When professors make adjustments for foreign students they set a double standard of judgment at the University which is beyond justification. A student is a student first and race and nationality should not be allowed to conflict with the academic standards set up by an institution. A two pronged academic standard of judgment is akin to modifying a state law to suit the needs of a particular case.

I fail to agree that race or nationality has anything to do with one's intelligence. By accepting concessions these 52 students accepted the fact that they were inferior academically to their American counterparts, and took advantage of American friendliness.

I do wish to congratulate those who, "opposed any such adjustments, expressing the de-

sire to be treated equally with American students."

Judged from the same standards as an American student a foreign student should feel proud of his work even if he gets a not-too-good grade. He can at least tell others with a broad smile that he is as good or as bad as an American student.

Mohan Goel
Graduate Student
Journalism

Progress!

Emerald Editor:

Life was happy, life was pain
Until the blasted A-Bomb
came

Life was joyous, full of fun
But then we developed the
Megaton

Even now we lose our minds
And follow useless shelter
signs!

Gene Poirier
Graduate Assistant
Anthropology

Golden Ghetto

Emerald Editor:

We were interested to find out about the Golden Ghetto controversy that is currently arousing the emotions of foreign as well as native students on this campus. The protagonists of this bold scheme assert that the way to produce the most potent mixture of native and imported cultures is to build a separate dormitory in which the courageous volunteers could be herded together.

Even though we are not necessarily admirers of the honorable Foreign Student Representative (Continued on page 3)

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 Editors
EDITORIAL BOARD:
Ron Buel, Phil Cogswell, Ted Mahar, Everett Dennis, Dave Sands, Dulcy Moran, Linda Brown, Bob Forsyth, Hal Snow, Grant Ledgerwood, Dot Ragen, Janet Goetze, and Bill Hitchison

Letters to the Editor

Dizzy Gillespie

Emerald Editor:

Sunday afternoon we had the privilege of seeing one of the finest musical performances that we have seen since we have been in Eugene. This was the Dizzy Gillespie Quintet with James Moody. The only bad part of the show was the small crowd, which more than likely

was because of lack of publicity.

Tickets to this show were comparable in price to similar attractions which have been held in McArthur Court, and probably the same show would have drawn a large crowd there. Performers of Gillespie's caliber come very seldom to this area, and when they come it seems there should be a sufficient number of interested people to support their appearances.

Whether it was lack of publicity or lack of interest, there are a lot of people who missed a fine show.

Russ Schuh
Senior, Foreign
Languages
Russ Roberts
Junior, Economics