

Jerry Frei cared too much

Jerry Frei had a tragic flaw—he cared too much.

In these days of semi-professional, make-a-buck college athletics, he cared about his players as individuals. He also cared about his own image. It was the latter worry that forced him to resign as head football coach.

He didn't quit because he wasn't a good coach or because he couldn't get along with his players; he quit because outside pressures—the pressures of University alumni and the media—had cast him in the role of "loser." And he couldn't go on leading the team in that image.

Frei couldn't have been expected to do otherwise in the situation.

But other persons could have prevented the situation from taking control of the coach. Outside pressure should not be allowed to control University programs—especially when the pressure forces a decision which is contrary to the best interests of that program, the University and its students.

ASUO President Iain More was right when he said there are only two ways to prevent these pressures from becoming all-powerful. You either change the structure and goals of the system or have an Athletic Director who supports his staff to the hilt when he knows they are right.

More says the University has not arrived at either point yet. He's right.

The University's Athletic Director should support his staff. If Norv Ritchey is not willing to support the members of his staff, to do battle with the "outside agitators," then he should follow Frei's lead and resign. The University has no room for an Athletic Director who buckles under to outside pressure.

More has also vowed that the ASUO will be "closely involved with the selection of a successor" as head football coach. The ASUO President said "Jerry Frei's critics can rest assured that our interests are in finding someone who reflects as closely as possible (Frei's) philosophy."

It's good More feels that way. Someone has to watch out for student interests.

Firm structure needed

Gov. McCall has cited the passage of the cigarette tax as a "beach head" in reforming Oregon's tax system. Let's hope he and other political leaders around the state are willing to make a Patton-like spearhead attack to win the tax war.

As it stands now Oregon's tax structure is a patchwork system held together by the thin thread of the cigarette tax. Past efforts to establish a better system of taxation have been voted down by the citizens of the state time and again. If this election didn't do it then something must be done to show the people of the state that things can't continue in this way.

How much longer can this state balance on the edge of disaster? Cuts, such as the ones being made this year, have a harder effect than just inconveniencing people for a short time. In a few years, when universities and state departments want to reinstitute cut programs it will be just that much more expensive and difficult to get the people who make up the programs to come here. Who would want to teach at a university or work for a department that might be moving your desk out any day?

What is needed is a sound, rational and fair tax system that can provide some sort of security as well as a base to build on.

Commentary

John Koford

New plans for the senate

John Koford is a former ASUO senator and a senior in philosophy.

Upon reading the Emerald Article on reapportionment, "Mixed Fruit and Democracy Square Off In Senate Battle," I felt it was my duty to clarify some errors.

I have served on the Governing Committee for two years now. The Governing Committee and not this special task force committee is charged with the duties of apportionment. The Governing Committee also has special duties and responsibilities where any constitutional change of this magnitude is concerned. Last winter term the Governing Committee studied ten different plans of apportionment carefully. It was decided after looking into each plan's practical applicability and value, that our present plan of apportionment offers the most democratic avenue for all interests to supply involvement into the A.S.U.O. senate. We felt that the responsibility for each senator to communicate with his constituency under any plan would boil down to a matter of individual responsibility. It is very in-

teresting to note that a plan similar to Mr. Loveys plan was in use up to winter term 1968. The present plan was adopted to allow representation from more special interest groups.

On Nov. 18, Stephanie Larsen appointed a committee to look into irregularities in the elections, not reapportionment. But from the very first meeting of this special task force committee Mr. Loveys and Mr. Salmony announced that the purpose of the committee was to draft a new system of apportionment as soon as possible. The questions of improvement of the present system and whether reapportionment was necessary were never taken up. The draft Mr. Loveys will present as the committee's recommendation is in fact the recommendation of Linda Duke, Nancy Harowitz, and Fred Loveys, three members of a 13 member committee. This draft closely resembles Mr. Loveys original plan with minor modifications. A.S.U.O. Vice President Larry Salmony

stated that he would have the committee meet everyday if necessary until a new plan of apportionment was adopted. He stated that only under rush and intimidation from the executive could a new plan be produced. Again I must state all of this occurred without any discussion of whether reapportionment was necessary.

The committee met with anywhere from three to five members attending out of thirteen members on the committee. Notices of the next meetings didn't appear in the paper for they were announced at the previous meeting and often the meetings were called for so soon that it would have been impossible to get an announcement in the Campus Briefs section of the Emerald. Though it will be denied none of the members of the committee I talked to were ever called by phone when three or four days occurred before the next meeting. Fred Loveys, Nancy Harowitz (not an actual member of the committee), and Linda Duke worked with Fred to draft his plan. David Jennings, John Stewart and myself opposed the plan from the beginning. Our chairman Fred Loveys has less than one year of experience in the A.S.U.O. senate, and one term's experience as head of the Governing Committee. Prior to his appointment to be head of the Governing Committee he had had no experience in this area. Both Nancy and Linda have had less than five weeks experience in the A.S.U.O. Nancy transferred to Oregon this fall and has experienced only one senate election.

The opposition is composed of David Jennings, John Stewart, and myself. We all have had two years of experience in the A.S.U.O. Plus John and myself have served regularly on the Governing Committee.

What it all boils down to is that those with experience greater than one year oppose the plan while those with experience ranging from four weeks to ten months in A.S.U.O. Governing support the plan. It should finally be stressed that the committee has never met with a quorum and has never been recognized by the A.S.U.O. senate.

I hope the Emerald now has a clearer idea of the issues and where the fifth regular member of the task force committee stands.

