

endorsement

Jim Davis best suited

The Emerald had hoped to endorse two or more ASUO presidential candidates for the upcoming ASUO primary elections. Of the three qualified candidates, however, one has shown himself to be so much more qualified than the rest that the *Emerald* will endorse only one candidate — Jim Davis. Based on an analysis of his experience and goals, his commitment to student issues and his capabilities, Davis is the candidate best suited to fill the office of ASUO president.

Davis' experience both inside and outside the ASUO is impressive. He has been involved for over four and a half years in such campus political areas as the ASUO executive, the EMU board, and ASUO programs. In addition he has served as both a Congressional intern and as a legislative intern.

His goals reflect his commitment to student issues. Davis plans to concentrate his energy in three areas: legislative affairs, academic matters and program administration and financing. Such a plan will insure that student interests are pursued both on and off campus. These student interest issues include faculty-course evaluations, student control of Mac Court, the expansion of student input into faculty tenure and promotion decisions, student collective bargaining, the extension of student control of the EMU and greater state support for higher education.

When the advancement of these issues are best served by going to the state legislature, Davis' experience as a legislative intern should prove invaluable. In addition, his experience as ASUO vice president will insure that these issues, many of which were raised by the present administration, will be continued.

Davis' commitment to these issues does not mean, however, that he will be forced into political confrontation with the University's administration. His knowledge of collective bargaining has taught him how to advance proposals without hopelessly alienating the University's administration. His ability to use alternate avenues such as the state board, the faculty and legislature offers a way to avoid deadlocked debate with the administration. Davis' capabilities and his commitment to these issues are his best recommendation.

Two other presidential candidates, Jack Condliffe and Jan Oliver, possess reasonable credentials and for this reason are worthy of consideration.

Condliffe's emphasis on affirmative action and minority programs and his union background with the University's Food Services student employee's union speaks well of his candidacy. His recognition of the importance of lobbying in Salem for student interests is also commendable. The strengths he could bring to such a legislative lobbying effort, however, do not match those of Davis. Our most serious doubts about Condliffe's candidacy concern his approach to dealing with the University's administration. He stresses private meeting situations and would prefer "just sitting down and talking about problems." This behind-the-doors approach is not healthy and is very seldom productive. We worry that his administration would be too private.

Condliffe would, however, be a valuable asset to next year's administration in the field of collective bargaining.

Oliver's strongest point is her knowledge of ASUO-funded programs, knowledge she gained through serving on this year's IFC. Oliver also echoes support for many of the issues and programs initiated by Jim Bernau's administration. She, too, is enthusiastic about advancing such programs as the Office of Student Advocacy and backs such student-oriented issues as collective bargaining and lobbying efforts in Salem.

Again, our reservations are based not on the issues she backs, but on the strengths she possesses to pursue these issues. When pressed for specifics on how she would work to attain these goals, her responses became generalized. She said she would use methods such as "communications" and "education" to gather student "support" and consensus for her programs. But, as with Condliffe, we would recommend her for a position in next year's administration.

The three remaining candidates are totally unacceptable and would seriously set back the gains in the areas of student advocacy made by previous ASUO executives.

Mark Powell classifies issues such as the tennis court suit and student control of Mac Court as "trivial." Powell has neither the determination nor the fortitude to push any program that might displease the University administration. The theme of his campaign has been not to rock the boat.

Arthur Kenny describes himself as a "slash-and-hack man." While fiscal conservation is a commendable trait, the irresponsible termination of programs can be disastrous. Kenny would be his own admission cut funding for ALERT, Women's Intercollegiate Athletics, Child Care and Development Center and Gay People's Alliance. The problem is that Kenny has no criteria for deciding which programs would be cut. He claims it is "obvious" which ones should be cut.

What can we say about Jim "Izzy Whetstone's" campaign, except that it is a joke. His candidacy is based on the assumption that since the ASUO in the past has wasted some student money, why not waste all of it? If we paid only \$2 or \$3 a year in incidental fees then we could compare Whetstone to an entertaining movie — but \$72 a year is too much for a few belly laughs.

The upcoming academic year will be the best chance students have ever had to expand the "student as consumer" philosophy. Because next year is a legislative year, students, lead by an aggressive ASUO executive, will be able to carry their concerns about tuition hikes, access to student faculty-course evaluation and other issues to the Oregon legislature as well as the state board. The candidate best qualified to present these concerns, both on campus and off, is Jim Davis.

IFC endorsement

Tyler first, Parr second

Two candidates for the Incidental Fee Committee, David Tyler and David Parr, possess the qualifications necessary to function well on the committee. Of the two candidates, however, David Tyler is the more qualified.

Tyler's qualifications rest on his perceptive analysis of several shortcomings of the IFC. Tyler objects, and rightly so, to the IFC's decision to drop the appeals process for program budgets. The only recourse programs now have is to hope for an ASUO Executive veto of the IFC's recommendation. Tyler also finds fault with a change in the IFC's procedural rules that would allow the chair the discretion to accept a member's vote by telephone when the committee has less than a quorum. Members that can't attend the meetings should not be allowed to vote.

Tyler is committed to insuring that programs funded by the IFC develop their full potential. To insure this development, he would encourage programs to include line items for publicity in their budget requests. He would also encourage the IFC to set aside enough money in its budget to provide publicity. When evaluating program budgets, Tyler would insist that the committee look at the program's past performance as well as its future plans and goals.

Tyler is aggressive, articulate and well-informed. His election to the IFC would add an assertive, program-oriented voice to the committee.

Parr, an incumbent IFC member, was appointed to the committee in February to fill an unexpired vacancy. During the fall term elections the *Emerald* endorsed Parr for the IFC. We were pleased to see him appointed this February. Since his appointment he has conscientiously and faithfully fulfilled the duties of his office.

His position on two issues, however, raises doubts in our minds. He defends the IFC's decision to drop the programs' appeal process on the grounds that the IFC needed to shorten the hearings and deliberation process. We agree time was critical, but the IFC should have shortened other parts of the process and not dropped the appeals section. Secondly, Parr's view of the IFC as a collection of members specializing in specific program areas is, perhaps, too narrow a perspective.

The third IFC candidate, Derek Wilkins, would not be an acceptable member of the committee. Wilkins' candidacy is based on revenge. In his interview, Wilkins frequently referred to how the IFC had mistreated his program, club sports. The programs he supported were almost exclusively athletic-types. He opposed funding foreign student unions. He was not familiar with the process by which the IFC distributes funds. Also, he demonstrated a lack of knowledge about the relationship of the IFC and ASUO Executive.

Letters

Mud-slinging

The hierarchy of the SEARCH Program and of the Survival Center have attempted to create an issue against Jim Davis based upon misrepresentations and innuendos which I find in very poor taste. In a letter printed in the *Emerald*, Wednesday, April 21, titled "Freshness Needed," they stated that Jim Davis had "misrepresented the programs" as "firm supporters of his latest bid for ASUO power". They further stated that "Mr. Davis has shown little support...and understanding" of their programs. Jim Davis has never stated that these programs support his campaign but rather that he supports them in their goals and objectives in their role in alternative education and student advocacy.

It is disappointing to see programs of the high quality of SEARCH and the Survival Center be dragged down to the level of mud-slinging and clearly partisan politics by a few individuals for their personal purposes.

Paul Bartel
pol. sc., jr.

For Oliver

During the past two years there has been a tendency for the ASUO executive in Suite 4 to preserve its idea of the status quo. Robert Liberty handed over the office of president to Jim Bernau, and now Bernau is preparing to hand it over to Jim Davis. As vice-president in charge of programs, all I have gotten from Mr. Davis has been a jumble of foul-ups, scheduling errors and a misrepresentation of our program to the IFC that I had to personally rectify. As for his "defense" of the students in front of the bogeyman of the Athletic Department, it was as skillfully executed as the crash of the Hindenberg. I should know as I was the "anonymous student" in Monday's article.

In contrast, there is the competency and openness that Jan Oliver will bring to the office of president. Jan has worked in the

University and has been an outstanding vice-chair for the Incidental Fee Committee. Her understanding of student needs and directions far outshines that of the executive and their candidate.

The vitality that Jan Oliver will bring to the ASUO certainly does not echo the qualities of any of the other candidates. Neither does her understanding nor willingness to take the student government out to the students. This year the students have the opportunity to elect someone willing to represent them. Use that opportunity, elect Jan Oliver.

Michael Schaefer
president, Political Science
Student Union

For Warren

The SUAB is a relatively new force on campus. It has not yet reached an effective level of initia-

tive into student grievances.

SUAB members are in a potentially strong position to fight for the interests of all University students through participation in the University Senate and General Faculty meetings.

To realize the potential of the SUAB, we need members who will be strong, aggressive and effective representatives of legitimate student concerns.

Jeff Warren has the capabilities to realize these potentials. By working with Jeff as co-chairperson of the California delegation to the Mock Democratic Convention, I know his abilities to work with people and provide balanced forceful leadership are excellent. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that Jeff Warren will be an articulate and effective member of the SUAB.

David McTeague
pol. sc., sr.

Editorial Board Guidelines

Elsewhere on this page is the *Emerald's* endorsement for ASUO president. With any such statement of opinion many questions arise. How did we evaluate the candidates? What criteria did we use? What expertise do we have to conduct such an evaluation?

Several weeks before the election dates, the *Emerald* began preparing for today's endorsement. First, we thoroughly researched all the issues that have concerned students in the past few years and those that will likely be a concern next year.

Then we conducted news interviews with each candidate which were published in a seven-part series that we concluded Thursday.

Following the news interviews each candidate was then interviewed by an editorial endorsement committee established for this election. Since the committee was composed of all *Emerald* editors who cover University affairs, the questions presented to the candidates covered a wide spectrum of interests. Since each editor is well-informed in his/her area the questions were extremely probing. If a candidate was unprepared or unknowledgeable, it showed immediately.

At the end of each 50-minute interview, the committee analyzed each candidate's strengths and weaknesses. Finally, after interviewing all candidates, the committee met once again to analyze, compare and contrast each candidate. The views expressed in the endorsement editorial represent the unanimous opinions of the committee.