

# IFC candidates: four great, three good, six poor

This year's Incidental Fee Committee race presents the most interesting cross section of candidates in recent memory. Two major slates involve all but three of the hopefuls: Jane Aiken, Bill Dick, Dave Donley and Kevin Farrell; and Mohammed Sarhan, Mayra Nieves, Wendy Young, Jean Saso, Rebecca Vance and Jim Anderson. Tom Bonner, Roger Leasure and Dave Simmons are not allied with any particular slate (Leasure and Simmons were running together, but have split up their efforts). Scott Palmer has withdrawn from the race.

The Aiken, Dick, Donley and Farrell slate is the toughest to analyze. The candidates make strange bedfellows, to say the least. If political leanings mean much in an IFC race, Dick, Donley and Farrell would have to be affixed to the right of center. Aiken definitely adheres to a more liberal philosophy. The candidates on this slate support one another because "we know we can work together." That must be it, because differences between the candidates are quite apparent.

The second ticket is allied by common beliefs: minority funding, the role of incidental fees on campus and stated priorities. The candidates do, however, differ in their approach to budgetary decision making.

The *Emerald's* endorsements follow neither of these slates. Our decisions are made strictly on the individuals and are based upon each candidate's perception of the role of an IFC member, stated priorities (both interest areas and total incidental fee budget), approach to the job, and knowledge of the incidental fee process.

The *Emerald* hopes students don't vote according to slates because, by their nature, slates tend to represent less than the total spectrum of student interests. The *Emerald* is endorsing on the basic premise that the most representative IFC would be a balanced, receptive IFC.

## General observations

Prior to listing our endorsements, there are some other general observations about the candidates which may aid students in making their choices.

The *Emerald* perceived a basic philosophical split between candidates which ran across any slate distinctions. Some candidates, chiefly Dick, Vance, Donley and Bonner, see their decisions as IFC members largely contingent upon the will of the majority of students (as derived from polls, personal contact or vote). Others, including Nieves, Anderson, Aaso and Aiken, see their roles as elected representatives of students — elected upon stands taken prior to election and assigned the task of adhering to those beliefs. This latter perception is more in line with how the *Emerald* views the role of any IFC member.

There was one other major thought which split the slates. Young, Saso, Anderson Simmons and Aiken favored taking a hard but healthy look at the funding levels of environmental and consumer programs to insure they were not funded at the expense of minority programs. The five agreed, however, that environmental and consumer programs should receive a high funding priority.

Only Donley seemed satisfied with the work of environmental and consumer groups saying their efforts provided tangible benefits and were therefore worthy of funding.

Virtually all candidates agreed on three things: the EMU budget should be carefully reviewed, the Athletic Department budget should be carefully reviewed, women's athletics should receive more funds.

## Aiken, Anderson, Nieves, Sarhan

Now on to the endorsements. The candidates fall into three categories: those receiving the unqualified endorsement of the *Emerald*, those receiving qualified endorsements and those deemed undesirable as IFC members.

Jane Aiken is an experienced hard worker and the best of the 13 IFC candidates. A senior in political science, Aiken has worked for two years on the Athletic Budget Committee. Combined with this nearly unequalled expertise in the AD's budget, she has expressed interest in funding minority programs on the premise that they provide educational benefits for the majority of the campus.

Aiken favors close examination of irresponsible use of funds and also suggested some unique ideas about providing student input in the budgetary process. Though Aiken, an unsuccessful candidate for ASUO president last year, has been involved in ASUO for some time, she has stayed out of the petty in-fighting and directed her energies to helping students.

Jim Anderson, a newcomer to student politics, is also an impressive candidate. He has spent much time reviewing the ASUO budgets of the past two

years and investigating the State Board of Higher Education IFC guidelines.

While opposing funding to community-oriented groups, Anderson supports funding of minority programs. He opposes increasing the incidental fee, however, and instead will work to distribute existing monies in a more equitable manner. Anderson also has said that under no circumstances will he seek re-election to the IFC if chosen this week. He insists on this so that any decision he makes will be made out of fairness and not political expediency. Anderson's sincerity and commitment to fairness makes him an outstanding candidate in this election.

Mayra Nieves also receives the *Emerald's* unqualified endorsement. Like Anderson, she is against raising the incidental fee, though she favors funding for minority programs because of the unique experiences she things they offer for the campus majority. She would like to take a long look at the EMU's \$600,000 allocation in an attempt to find corners to cut.

Nieves also favors increased women's athletic programs though she would oppose giving money to programs which are primarily directed toward the community. Nieves, an EOS student from Puerto Rico, is a freshman who could provide future ASUO administrations with continuity.

Muhammed Sahran, a junior in computer science, is an articulate and persuasive candidate. If an IFC member, Sahran plans to judge each group by the student interest it generates and the specific program it presents to the IFC. He believes that each program should be held strictly accountable for any student funds it receives. As a third world student, Sahran admits that he leans toward funding minority programs though he would judge each budget by its individual merits.

Sahran would give close scrutiny to the EMU and AD budgets so that any increased minority funding would not increase the incidental fee. He is a die-hard believer in the inquisitive nature of students, and is refreshingly optimistic about students' abilities to reconcile their differences. He would make an able IFC member.

## Farrell, Saso, Young

Three other candidates have a "qualified" *Emerald* endorsement. Though we believe that these three would be viable IFC members, we must express reservations.

Kevin Farrell, a junior in Public Administration, has stressed that his main goal is to be fair and objective in evaluating all programs. He lacks a penetrating knowledge of ASUO, but convincingly stated that he would objectively weigh each program in terms of its past performance and give consideration to student input. He is concerned with developing a better distribution system for athletic tickets. While it is bothersome that we don't know his precise priorities, it is to his credit that Farrell is approaching the IFC with an open mind and does not represent any special interest. He would be a viable committee member.

Jean Saso similarly receives a qualified *Emerald* endorsement. Saso, a junior in journalism, favors funding for minority groups and women's athletics. She does not want to increase the incidental fee, and favors more closely checking the monolithic EMU budget. She opposes funding programs which serve primarily community — and not campus — needs. Like Farrell, she did not show a deep knowledge of the ASUO, but with experience, Saso could be a good IFC member.

Wendy Young, a senior in anthropology, also gets a qualified yes from the *Emerald*. She sees a need for minority programs which work to increase the social awareness of the majority. She favors a more equitable distribution between current ASUO programs and would give close scrutiny to the Forensics, EMU and OSPIRG budgets which currently receive a large portion of IFC funds while minority programs are slashed.

Moreover, Young could provide the new IFC with a perspective which most candidates lack. As co-director of an ASUO program, the University Feminists, Young understand program problems and the nuts and bolts of program budgeting. She is not a dynamic or inspiring candidate though the *Emerald* believes she is one of the top seven in the race.

## Less than desirable

The fact that the *Emerald* gave only qualified endorsements to Saso, Farrell and Young should not obscure the fact that the remaining candidates would be undesirable IFC members.

Bill Dick is the only current IFC member seeking re-election. In the past year, Dick has consistently voted to decrease minority programs in the name of economy, while he had no qualms about raising allocations to non-minority programs. For example,

he voted to give OSPIRG a cost-of-living increase when their budget, at \$40,000, was already the fifth largest granted by the IFC.

Dick recently voted to give athletes 200 free seats in basketball games. He defends this vote by saying that this did not take away from the student seats since the giveaways did not detract from the number of student tickets sold. The *Emerald* believes, however, that these 200 seats come at the expense of the average student who must now make room for the athletes in the already tight confines of Mac Court's student section. If these 200 seats were in fact available, the *Emerald* believes the tickets should have been distributed on a lottery basis to all the students rather than awarded to a privileged few. It should be noted that Bill Dick is a very sincere and hard working person. As an IFC member, however, Dick did not consider the many diverse elements which comprise the University. Because of this, the *Emerald* does not recommend his re-election.

Rebecca Vance, running on the third world slate, is not an impressive candidate. She showed little understanding of the ASUO processes and organizations. Though she is personally for third world group funding, she says that she would vote against minority programs if the majority of the students were opposed to such funding. Consequently, she could not say what her priorities or goals were since she is not aware of the student opinion.

Vance shows few leadership qualities, and as a non-committed person could be subject to the pressure of any group which could persuade her that it represented the nebulous majority.

David Donley's candidacy is rather enigmatic. He wants to keep the incidental fee down, yet he favors doubling the Athletic Department's allocation to \$300,000 if he finds student support. Though he would favor this dramatic increase, he stated a predisposition against minority and "special interest" groups in the name of economy. The *Emerald* finds this incongruous. On one hand Donley would reduce minority funding — which comprises only three per cent of the total IFC budget — saying they only serve special interests. Yet he would double the AD's allocation to comprise 30 per cent of the IFC budget. Donley does not seem as opposed to special interests as much as he is opposed to special interests which do not benefit sports fans.

Donley also says he would judge groups by their "tangible results." The incidental fee, however, is by definition for "education and cultural enrichment." The *Emerald* does not believe that education and cultural enrichment can be quantified into tangible results.

The worst candidate of the election is Tom Bonner. Bonner, a junior in mathematics, is a perennial ASUO candidate running whenever an election comes up. He also has the habit of changing his platform in each election, always picking the stands which are most expedient. This year's platform calls for stopping funding for any group which is not white, male and heterosexual. Bonner claims that this would decrease incidental fees, and that minority students would be more respected if they did not seek student money. (For example, Bonner stated that Gay People's Alliance would be more respected if they did not direct their energies for political events and instead did projects to help elderly people and work in recycling efforts.)

The *Emerald* finds Bonner's overall approach to be shallow and opportunistic. Eliminating minority programs would only cut the \$1 million IFC budget by three per cent, a decrease which easily would be eaten up by EMU inflation. While Bonner's numerous candidacies always provide the ASUO races with much-needed comic relief, he has little to offer students or the funding process.

David Simmons and Roger Leasure would not make good IFC members. While both have had student government experience at Lane Community College, neither showed much understanding of ASUO. The two candidates took few stands on their priorities or goals, saying they would support what the students wanted. The *Emerald* believes that students deserve more information about a candidate's stands than a lofty endorsement of democracy. Leasure's and Simmons' non-committal attitudes seem to be an outgrowth of their fundamental ignorance of ASUO.

It should also be noted that Simmons made a misleading statement in his Voters Guide statement when he identified himself as LCC treasurer. Actually, he only occasionally served as acting treasurer in instances where the elected treasurer was absent.

The *Emerald* believes that an IFC made up of Jane Aiken, Jim Anderson, Mayra Nieves, Mohammed Sahran, Kevin Farrell, Jean Saso and Wendy Young would be a hard working and balanced IFC which would be receptive and sensitive to student interests.