

Review aids second stage

The ASUO Executive has completed the first stage of its annual budgeting process. Out of this process, two documents have emerged; the ASUO Executive budget recommendation for 1976-77 and the ASUO mid-year fiscal review.

For the first time in recent years the ASUO has published a mid-year fiscal review. The idea originated last year, but according to the executive, "a lack of funds and staff" prevented its publication. This year students will have access to a document that lists not only the programs funded under this year's budget but also lists how the programs are spending their money.

This document will be an essential tool for both the IFC and the ASUO Executive as the budgeting process goes into its second stage. The IFC and the executive now can compare the past performance of programs against their present requests for next year. They will be able to spot such trouble areas as over-expenditure of funds, over-budgeted line items and poor management practices.

Such criteria are needed. A constitutional amendment limits the maximum increase to seven per cent. In addition the ASUO is committed to holding down incidental fee charges as much as possible.

In the past such evaluations were difficult. The figures weren't complete until the end of the fiscal year, after the new budget had already been passed. Programs that mismanaged their funds or deviated from their goals weren't identified until it was late.

Overall the executive already has trimmed some \$209,680 from the initial program requests and has managed to keep the increase over last year to five per cent. While some of these cuts may prove unpopular, at least students who wish to oppose these cuts or offer other input will find the mid-year review an accurate and detailed source to cite when dealing with the budgeting process.

Letters

Forcibly expelled

It is indeed unfortunate that many people do not understand, and/or appreciate, feminist objections to the use of the generic man and other sexist language. The use of sexist language may not be the greatest obstacle in the struggle for sexual equality, but it is important that we eliminate sexism from our language. We must realize that we cannot accept any situation which posits an inequality between the sexes.

The use of the generic man projects the image of a culture which is defined in male terms. The use of the generic man performs not only a cognitive function but it also determines how we evaluate and perceive the world. The generic man describes a world in which men are omnipresent. We define our reality in male terms because maleness is the standard in this society, it is one of those neat little "hidden persuaders" which reaffirm male dominance and prestige. The generic man describes a world in which women are invisible, women become an appendage to the "man's world."

The use of such terms as "man" kind and chair "man" is not harmless. Those who contend that we are being "trivial" in objecting to such language, it seems to me, do not appreciate how subtle sexism is. We must not only eliminate the obvious sexism in our society, we must abolish every element of our society which promotes an imbalance of privilege and prestige between the sexes. Sexist language is one of those "subtle" means by which we learn that male is better and that maleness is the standard in this society.

I reject sexist language, and the use of the generic man, because it does promote the concept that it is a "man's world." The generic man will not die a "natural death." We must forcibly expel "him" from

our language because "he" oppresses women.

Scot Felderman
Political Science

Use inefficient

You come to campus, go to your classes and get out around 3:30 or 4:30. Now you need some exercise before going home to dinner and study. So like many people here at Oregon you choose to play basketball. You go to the P.E. Department and check out a ball, which cannot be used on the outside courts. Then you run up to the gym only to find out the gyms are full with intramural games from 3:30 to 6:30 every day. You're out of luck.

I think the intramural coordinator could alternate periods of recreation and intramural. My main complaint is that when there is a forfeit in the intramural game, as happens quite often, the team which showed up gets to "rule" the gym for the time that was allotted for their game.

Each gym accommodates about 30 people playing ball, four on four, during the time of "open" recreation. What usually happens after a forfeit is that the team "given" the gym gathers a few more friends, enough to play five on five. Then they proceed to have "free play," taking up the entire court until their time is up. When the men waiting to play (around ten or 15 of them) try to make use of the gym, the intramural coordinator tells them they can't.

It is very inefficient use of the recreation facility when 15 must stand and watch ten play, when all 25 could play and all enjoy it.

Matt Wetzel
pre-CSPA, soph.



"WELL, THAT'S ANOTHER OF OUR MINOR CIA OFFICIALS WHO WON'T BE TALKING TO THE PRESS ANY MORE!"

opinion

Corporate farming opposed

The Survival Center is supporting the initiative petition to "Restrict Corporate Farming in Oregon." This petition must collect 61,646 signatures by July 2, 1976, to place a state constitutional amendment on the ballot in November, 1976. This initiative is being sponsored among others by the Oregon State Grange and the Oregon AFL-CIO and has been endorsed by the Oregon Consumer League.

There are many reasons for Survival Center support of this initiative petition with land control and consumer protection heading the list. It is of vital importance to those of us Oregonians concerned about unrestrained growth in Oregon to keep our farm-land in the hands of Oregonians. If land use planning is to be effective, it is much better to deal with the land owners who have something of themselves invested into the land as opposed to some monolithic corporation whose only motive is profit. A large conglomerate corporation which has farming interests will, as experience has shown, sell its (our) valuable farmland for development at the first opportunity to turn a profit. We feel Oregon's family farmers will be more resistive to development and will protect all Oregonians interests much better than out of state or even multi-national conglomerates who frankly could care less about the quality of life in our farming regions.

The Oregon Consumer League has endorsed this initiative petition because vertical integration and monopolization of food production is increas-

ing rapidly in the United States. Large corporations seek to control food production from the growing of seeds to growing and harvesting the crop to packaging and distributing the final plastic-wrapped, preservative-filled product. This vertical integration is dangerous to consumers because competition has at best been severely limited. Monopolization is another consumer issue. Huge corporations may and do control almost all production of certain commodities and the resultant effect is rising food costs with no consumer control of prices.

Looking at the issue from a broad perspective, it is obvious that public policy is being determined by larger and larger institutions which are less and less responsive to individual needs. This is a dangerous situation. The idea that multi-national corporations that have no interest in protecting the quality of life in Oregon may soon control large tracts of farmland is also very dangerous. The Survival Center urges your support of the initiative petition to restrict corporate farming in Oregon. Help insure competition for farm commodities. Help keep Oregon's farmlands in the hands of Oregonians. Help restrict corporate farming in Oregon.

Michael McClellan
Survival Center director

Gene Clak
Survival Center member

Rights deprived

I am getting tired of all these people running around campus trying to get "Non-Union" lettuce removed from the eating facilities. What they are trying to do is to deprive us of one of our rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, the freedom of choice. When I go get a salad, I really do not care whose lettuce is whose. I get the lettuce that is fresher-looking, or the particular type that I feel like eating. If either type of lettuce is removed from campus, then we do not have much choice. The cafeteria can feed us whatever they want no matter how long it has been sitting around. If one type of lettuce is banned, then the produce company can give us whatever garbage it wants and tell us that is the only lettuce it has. We would have to buy it or not have any lettuce at all.

I am not a supporter of the Teamsters; they are too big and too powerful in this country. I do not support the Farmworkers either, because once they organize they will become big business like the Teamsters; just what this country needs, another union.

I do not like the idea of discrimination against anyone. I would just like to be left alone to choose my own salad.

Kelly Baker
Speech, fr.

Menace plagues

In regards to the ever-present bicycle menace that plagues our campus. I ride my bike between classes, and upon occasions, screech terror into unsuspecting students. Concern for student safety has brought me to speculate and propose.

While questioning fellow bikers, and experimenting with two-footed travel, I'm relieved to find salience in resolving this issue. Neither biker nor pedestrian desires a careless collision crises to complicate their day. The problem seems to be one of agreement, probability and unified support.

I propose some simple standard rules to relieve the potential paranoia. 1) Pass fellow bikers on the right side. 2) Bikers must yield and respect pedestrian travel. 3) Bikers must make their presence

known, when possible doubt may arise. 4) Basic speed of eight mph on pathways, and 15-mph on 13th Street. Use your judgment.

Common agreement versus confusion, that's what we need. Admittedly there may be some unmentioned variables of conflict, but I believe some form of common agreement will relieve the pedestrian from many of our current campus "cyclopaths."

Jon Nachtwey
pre-journalism, soph.

Letters policy

The Emerald will accept and try to print all letters containing fair comment on ideas and topics of concern or interest to the University community. Because of space limitations, letters must be no more than 200 words, typed triple-spaced, dated and signed with the person's major. No unsigned letters will be published. Longer opinion columns will be published whenever possible after being submitted to the editorial page editor. The limit on opinion columns is 800 words, using the same format as letters.

Wednesday, March 3, 1976