

Viewpoint

Schwindt clarifies position

By PATRICIA SCHWINDT

On November 15, I received a registered letter from Paul Nelson, administrative assistant to the ASUO executive. The letter was typed on ASUO stationery by the ASUO secretary, presumably on ASUO time. The letter demanded retraction of the following two paragraphs from my November 1 commentary:

"...at the same time, the executive's administrative assistant was receiving \$105.00 per month for (assuming the coalition is correct) 'doing nothing' in Portland and keeping no office hours."

"...Other questionable requisitions were...over \$70.00 for a weekend in Bend for the administrative assistant and his friends to attend the Demo-Forum, staying in the resort it was held."

If these two statements are defamatory, then I am sorry. I did not mean for them to "carry defamatory implications of misconduct" on the part of the administrative assistant. My comments were directed toward Leo and Barnett.

The assumption that was made in the first statement should not have been made. The administrative assistant did do something last summer and that is the extent to which the first statement is false. According to the ASUO secretary, to whom Nelson reported last summer, one of the things he did was to reword that portion of the constitution that deals with the IFC. You see, the constitution was very lax in this area and the IFC was given the power to carry on business as they pleased, without executive intervention. This was one of the sources of controversy between the IFC and the executive while I was in the controller's office.

The fact that Paul Nelson did work last summer does not affect the point that I was making. Nelson was not keeping office hours and nonregular office hours were one of the major reasons Leo gave for suspending the IFC.

As to the second statement, according to Nelson, the people who went on the Demo-Forum trip were not friends of his. However, according to the ASUO secretary, the people who went on this trip were solicited primarily from word of mouth, Nelson's mouth included. There was one notice placed in the notice case by the candy store in the EMU and another in the Law School. The executive did not think to make notice of the event until after the Emerald stopped publication for the summer. In my research, I could obtain only nine names of students who went on the trip. Seventy dollars was requisitioned for a two room suite and \$12.50 for a room for Paul Nelson. The requisition was rushed into the controller's office and I was told that I must sign it immediately because the request for reservations had to go into the mail right away. This last minute rush was not rare and it stuck in my mind because I wanted to question the requisition, but, due to the urgency, I could not.

In defense of the commentary that I wrote, I was expressing what I observed while I was in the controller's office. I merely wanted to expose the lack of communication, the inability to criticize the executive's spending, and the lack of careful consideration toward each action taken. The fact that there have been certain resolutions made, due to the threat of recall, is not significant.

Schwindt was an assistant ASUO controller last summer.

Letters

Let's do it

I personally find no political regime more intolerable and more in need of removal than a corruption-ridden right-wing administration. An anti-daycare, pro-athletic department student administration can be characterized as nothing other than right wing. An administration which uses student funds for the private uses of its members and its friends can be characterized as nothing other than corruption-ridden. Especially when the charges aren't even really denied, but rather glossed over by slick language. I'm sick of this type of garbage from the clowns and crooks on the third floor of the EMU and I salute the Eugene Coalition for trying to clean up the mess. I'm delighted with the opportunity to vote to recall Leo. Furthermore, I suggest fellow students who are rightly concerned with Nixon's abuses that they also concern themselves with the abuses carried on here by Leo. This mess can be cleaned up quickly. Let's do it.

Ellen Roberts

Recall the Emerald?

The Emerald has done it again. I suppose that whoever wrote the editorial on the Leo recall sincerely believes Leo should not be recalled, but the body of the editorial convinced me that Leo, at least, and perhaps the Emerald as well should be recalled.

1) The Emerald has either the nerve or stupidity (you pick 'em) to be satisfied with a Leo defense of misuse of funds which says "the flowers were ordered but the florist failed to deliver them." I cannot see how the florist's incompetence lessens the wrongfulness of this attempted misuse of funds by the ASUO executive. What is this country coming to if bull like this will be tolerated? Count me out! Keeping Leo is as bad as keeping Nixon. There can be no doubt about it.

2) The Emerald accepts the explanation that Barnett mistakenly copied the wrong

number on the Fred Loveys' loan. I suppose they also accept Nixon's feeble explanation on how he mistakenly "lost the missing tapes."

3) The Emerald feels that Leo's intolerable policies do not constitute grounds for recall. I suggest they reread the ASUO constitution before making such foolish characteristics and before dismissing such serious charges lightly.

4) A final note. Not only do I consider daycare a better use of student money than the Emerald, but I would also suggest that the program be expanded to provide a place where the editors of the Emerald can spend their days and play doctor and nurse as well as journalist.

Robert Star
Grad. Business

The following for Leo

We the following Program Directors, would like to express our support for the Leo-Barnett Administration and ask that students investigate the motives and purpose behind the recall movement before voting. It is very disappointing to see this recall group using the Watergate expose in such a negative manner when it should be used as a positive tool. To compare Greg and Debbie to the Nixon Administration is opportunism at its extreme and hints vaguely of McCarthyism, so prevalent about twenty years ago, especially in light of the unfounded charges leveled at the ASUO Executive. The power of recall should be seen as a valuable tool in respect to political corruption not as a weapon to support unfounded and untrue charges simply because of conflicting beliefs or interests.

Anne Higgins, ASUO Housing Director
Elizabeth Benson, ASUO International Education Center

Charlie Itzen, Editor Second Degree GSC (Graduate Student Council)

Evelyn Corman, ALERT
Gordon Little, Oregon Prisoner's Coalition

Letters

Revolutionary retreads

In the confusion of this absurd recall matter, the people seem to be almost blind to the most important cause of this unnecessary mess. The cause is that group of pseudo-revolutionary retreads, the "Eugene Coalition Liberation Support Movement" (I wonder if they understand their own name).

While people are becoming very worked up on issues that consist of lies, half-truths and illegitimate rhetoric in general, the Eugene Coalition is being left alone to continue this worthless crusade of irresponsible and reckless political action.

I firmly believe that no matter what side of the political spectrum an organization comes from, it is only credible if it deals in constructive and responsible political action. The Eugene Coalition deals in the opposite.

The Eugene Coalition is a group of leftovers from the past. There are many in this group whose main purpose could be considered as "revolution for the hell of it." I have learned that many of its members are non-students, which in itself should make plenty of students rather disgusted. They participate in cause after cause in order to show their frustrations due to their deflated political base and rejected political egos. They cannot face realities.

An excellent example of the Coalition in action occurred near the end of the middle east war. I was spending time at the Jewish Student Union booth and had a good opportunity to watch their actions. During the war, the Coalition was working hand in hand with the Arabs. Within days after the second cease-fire and the Arabs fairly well crushed, they realized it was a lost cause. So, they abandoned their Arab friends in order to begin another one of the

causes. It just so happened that Greg Leo was the easiest person to go after, much of which had to do with facts totally unrelated to the ASUO leadership. There were the frustrations of Nixon's madness and executive power in general. The coalition had to go for the closest and most vulnerable person around, and that was Greg Leo. Besides, he was a Republican.

I am just wondering how long the students at the U of O will tolerate and be taken in by this negative group of political leftovers. They are insults to the intelligence of all students, and they are insults to responsible and constructive political action in general.

I sincerely hope that students will realize and give a damn about the necessity of responsive and creative government in the ASUO and go out in full force to support Greg Leo and Debbie Barnett.

Marc Tanzer
Sociology & Political Science

Stands behind Leo

As a student and student body President at LOC, and a U of O student, I urge everybody to stand behind Greg Leo our ASUO President.

The rumored "charges" that I've seen published are not charges. The man has done nothing wrong. When there is a controversial decision to be made, and the system provides for the making of this decision, one must respect the democratic process involved without personal bias towards the man.

Greg has made decisions on controversial issues but the system provided for the making of these decisions and he has always had the welfare of the students in mind. Did you ever stop to think of the possibility that a recall could be just what the administration wishes?

Barry Hood

Viewpoint

Students must recall Leo

The following was written by the Eugene Coalition. For further information contact Mike Goldstein, Tony Gregg, or Debbie Mattison at 343-3282.

It has become clear to those of us who have been working on the recall campaign for the past month that the real question which concerns the students is not whether or not Leo has been a worthy president, for no one except the small coterie of ASUO politicians who owe their jobs to Leo have maintained that he has, but rather whether or not it would do any good to have Leo removed.

We believe that the editorial in Thursday's Emerald is emblematic of the apathetic and acquiescent mentality which has allowed the ASUO to degenerate into the mess that it has become. While cynics may scoff at the "childishness" of ASUO politics, the fact is that the ASUO administers a budget which amounts to over \$1,000,000 in student money.

The thrust of the Emerald's editorial is that it is not worth the effort to recall Leo even though he has not been an especially good president. The Emerald does not believe that Leo was justified in his Day Care veto. The Emerald does not dispute the fact that Leo's bargain with the Athletic Department has cost the students dearly. And the Emerald does not dispute that Leo's vendetta war against the Incidental Fee Committee unnecessarily paralyzed student government for months.

According to the Emerald, the recall election is a referendum on whether or not Leo-Barnett "are doing the job students elected them to do." We believe that an examination of the Leo-

Barnett record clearly demonstrates that they are not.

1) We do not believe that Leo was elected by the students so that he could veto the Day Care budget. This veto, by Leo's own admission severely demoralized the Day Care program. Leo persisted in going through with his veto even though he was presented with a petition of over 2,000 signatures collected in 48 hours urging him to reconsider.

2) We do not believe that students elected Leo so that he could enter into a bargain with the Athletic Department which allowed the A.D. to realize a fat surplus at the expense of the students. The agreement provided that the A.D. would receive extensive support out of student fees in addition to the right to sell season tickets and keep all the proceeds. We do not believe that the students wish to see their money wasted in this manner.

3) We do not believe that the students elected Leo to have him freeze the funds of the Incidental Fee Committee, violate the ASUO Constitution, and cripple student government for months in the furtherance of a personal vendetta.

We believe that both Leo's program priorities and his methods stand in complete opposition to the needs and wishes of most students. We do not believe that the students elected Leo so that he could oppose programs like Day Care while helping student money unnecessarily find its way into the coffers of the Athletic Department. Leo's campaign last spring was an exercise in evasion. Had Leo stated what he would do, he would never have been elected. Now he must be recalled.