

Emerald endorsement interviews

The real winners in Wednesday's Incidental Fee Committee elections will be the students.

Ten candidates are competing for five at-large spots on the committee. With few exceptions the candidates are more than capable of representing student interest in incidental fee allocation.

The Emerald interviewed nine of the 10 Monday for the purpose of endorsing a candidate for each position.

Members of the endorsement panel sought indications of the candidate's working knowledge of the University fiscal process as well as indications of the candidates fiscal priorities.

In all cases the endorsement decision was difficult. In the end the Emerald attempted to balance the recommended slate between diverse interests.

Following are the Emerald's Recommendations.

Position No. 1

Gloria Gonzalez and Rick Coursey are seeking election to this position. The Emerald endorses Gonzalez.

Coursey is a capable, knowledgeable candidate. He understands the fiscal process. But Coursey is a conservative by nature and the criteria by which he would judge programs seeking money is extremely tight. Student government must be run as a business, Coursey says. That may be so. Those agreeing with that concept would do well to support Coursey who would be an admirable spokesman for that point of view.

Gonzalez has a much broader viewpoint. She has a social awareness of the ASUO's role in funding programs which are not necessarily well known or understood by a great number of students.

Being both a woman and a Chicano, she will bring a new perspective to the budgetary process.

Position No. 2

Carol Whitcomb and Andy Holcomb are seeking election to Position No. 2. The Emerald endorses Holcomb.

Whitcomb criticized the overlap in

ASUO program budgets, a viable criticism. But her knowledge of the ASUO budgetary process seems limited, and she has a hard time outlining her budgetary criteria because of that. While Whitcomb would probably prove a fast learner there is very little time for beginners to catch on during the committee's inaugural session.

Holcomb, on the other hand, knows the process. He offers several definite budgetary alternatives criticizing program salary budgets and making a strong and rational case for cutting the Athletic Department's budget. It is fashionable to oppose funding the AD, but Holcomb has done his homework. He would like to fund women's athletics through AD monies. What is more he doubts the appropriateness of allocating the Club Sports Program.

Position No. 3

This is the weakest of the races. Running are former ASUO senator Hank Itkin and a relative newcomer to campus politics Manuel Hernandez. The Emerald endorses Hernandez with qualification.

Itkin is a veteran of the ASUO senate. Given that he should have a working knowledge of the fiscal process that would ordinarily be of some value to the Incidental Fee Committee. But Itkin's senate career is totally undistinguished. Nothing in his record would indicate he has mastered that understanding. Itkin is closely aligned with the old senate factions that did so much to destroy the credibility of that body. He is also an active critic of the Emerald and this endorsement should be considered in that light.

There would be no problem in this race if Hernandez were an outstanding candidate. But he is not. His understanding of the incidental fee system is perceptible, but weak.

What Hernandez does have is a sense of the ASUO's role in promoting social change. He feels the University should be doing more in the community, and that is one point that should be represented on the committee.

If Hernandez can learn quickly he will serve well on the committee. While there is a risk in this already alluded to in a previous endorsement, the Emerald

nevertheless recommends that course here.

Position No. 4

This race is another tossup, but from a different point of view. Both candidates are exceptional, articulate spokeswomen for divergent points of view. Running are Sara Rosenfeld and Gail Hoffnagle. The Emerald endorses Hoffnagle, but primarily because her point of view deserves to be heard.

The primary difference between these two candidate is whether or not to cut the Athletic Department. Hoffnagle was the only candidate interviewed who felt the majority of students got their money's worth out of the AD. While she supports funding women's athletics she is opposed, at this point anyway, of cutting the AD's budget to get the funds.

Hoffnagle served last year on the ASUO Fiscal Committee as a non-voting nonsenate representative. That experience will prove invaluable.

Rosenfeld's position on the AD is similar to most of the other candidates. It is also the Emerald's position, and there are few students capable of representing that position as well as Rosenfeld.

The Emerald endorses Hoffnagle, with the understanding that Rosenfeld would make an excellent committee member.

Position No. 5

The two candidates for this position are Randy Shilts and Gary Young Kim. Unfortunately Kim did not appear for his endorsement interview and it would be unfair to endorse for the position for that reason.

Nevertheless, to treat the race in a backhanded sort of way, it should be mentioned that Shilts is an impressive candidate. He is an avowed homosexual, chairman of the Gay People's Alliance and a knowledgeable newcomer to ASUO politics.

He ran for and was elected to an ASUO senate seat in the last election. He would have been as asset to that organization. He talks convincingly of bringing some leadership back to student government, and he is more capable than most of providing it.

Letters

From Holcomb

It's time I tell you where I stand. Although the budget hearings have yet to begin, and the specifics of each request are more or less unknown at this time, I think I can still give you a pretty clear indication of my orientation with regards to incidental fee allocation.

1) The operation of ASUO programs should rely more on student volunteers. Eighty-three individuals are presently on the ASUO payroll . . . with the total in salaries for the year well over \$56,000.00. That's nearly one-sixth of the \$315,000.00 total that students have to allocate (minus the EMU and AD). That's a waste of resources. In some programs, over half the budget goes into salaries.

2) Priorities of purpose: educational-cultural vs. recreational. The programs supported by incidental fees generally fall into the aforementioned categories.

Oregon Daily Emerald

Although recreation is important, priority has to be given to educational-cultural programs. The funding of SEARCH is of much greater salience than the funding of the ski team or the athletic department.

3) A balance must exist between programs of mass participation and of those which fulfill specialized needs. ESCAPE involves 600 students and many individuals in the community. On the other hand, supportive services provides emergency funds for disadvantaged students. Can one be sacrificed because of the lack of mass participation? No.

4) ASUO programs should be more self-supporting. There are alternatives to funding available to many programs. These should be explored. An example of this is the Crisis Center working on an "alternative" funding through stipends from the Counseling Dept.

Andy Holcomb
Pos. 2

For Shilts

Few candidates for any ASUO office have shown the sincerity, conscience and courage of Randy Shilts.

His funding priorities are for — day care.

Innovative education programs as the Oregon Prisoner's Coalition, Women's studies, Outdoor Program and such new programs that may arise in the next year.

Randy, obviously, supports minority programs and their efforts to raise the awareness of students.

But beyond his role on Committee member, Randy Shilts will be a unique leader for the U of O community. In the next year, issues will confront the University that will call for a strong voice to speak out for student interests. As part of the now small student government, Randy will have no fear to speak out.

Randy is not a student politician, but he is a leader. He cares about student interests and is willing to work for them.

He has already shown unique courage in his outspoken positions for gay and women's rights.

Randy has already succeeded in his campaigns, in that he has worked to bring an open and free discussion of homosexuality to the campus. Though this has not always been in kind terms, I believe it has already been good for hetero- and homosexual alike (if there is that much of a difference between the two).

All students will benefit from his conscientious leadership.

I urge the University to come out in support of Randy Shilts for fee allocation Position number 5. It is a unique opportunity for all of us.

Pamela Evans
Junior, Drama
Page 5