

Primary '76
Emerald Endorsements

Not Weinstein

State Attorney General — For the office of attorney general, Democrats are going to have a tough choice between Jim Redden and Don Willner. Both candidates are strong on consumer protection. Both favor a regional prison system to take the pressure off the state penitentiary. The *Emerald*, however, favors Redden over Willner. Redden's background as a state representative and his term as state treasurer will demonstrate his ability to administer a state agency. He leans toward mandatory sentencing. He also has proposed a system of "shock parole" in which people immediately paroled after being convicted of lesser crimes are put in jail for about a month before being released on parole.

On the GOP side, Republican voters can immediately scratch Bill Jolley. While it is possible for a person with no law degree to serve as a judge, it is doubtful that a person without an extensive law background could serve as the chief prosecutor for Oregon or supervise a legal staff.

The issue of gun control is the major factor that divides the other three GOP candidates. Stan Bunn and Jim Durham are both opposed to gun control. The only GOP candidate to support gun control and the *Emerald's* choice for Republican voters is Lyndon "Tuck" Wilson. Wilson advocates the prohibition of "Saturday night specials" and the licensing of handgun owners and the registration of the weapons. Wilson has served on the State Law Enforcement Council and the Criminal Justice Advisory Committee. He favors a victims' assistance program and regional correctional facilities. His stand on handguns reflects his tough, aggressive personality.

County Commissioner Position One — The *Emerald* wants to make it clear that there is one Democratic candidate for this race that is totally unacceptable. That candidate is Archie Weinstein. Weinstein's approach to government is that of a spoiled rich kid that has had his toy taken away and wants to kick someone. He's still sore that Urban Renewal Agency forced him out of his war surplus store. He's rich enough and capricious enough to play the part of a dilettante in the serious business of county government. His slash and hack attitude toward the county budget would mean a decrease in such public services as road construction and maintenance and police protection.

To counter this reckless attitude, the *Emerald* endorses Nancy Hayward. Hayward's support of the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC), the 1990 Plan and BRING reflect her commitment to keeping this county and Oregon livable. Her voice on the County Board of Commissioners is a voice for the protection of the environment.

Also on the ballot is Doug Melevin. We are impressed with Melevin's executive and administrative abilities but we are worried by his resistance to state-wide land use planning. He is also opposed to the county jail measure and the idea of regional correctional facilities, whereas Hayward supports both of these issues.

For the Republicans, the *Emerald* supports John Parkhurst. Parkhurst supports the plan for the new county jail and supports the concept of a solid waste recycling plant. On the other hand, his opponent Ed Reindl is against the new jail and the recycling of solid waste. Reindl is also a backer of the initiative to abolish LCDC.

County Commissioner Position Three — For this position, Democratic voters must choose from among Jack Craig, John Dotson and Frank Elliott. For 14 years Elliott has dominated the commission. For 14 years his reactionary political and fiscal stands and his rural orientation have placed him at odds with the more progressive members of the commission. Not surprisingly, he opposes the new jail and voted against the Willamette Greenway plan. Fourteen years is enough. The *Emerald* endorses Jack Craig. Craig came within 483 votes of beating Elliott in the last primary. Craig supports the construction of the new jail. He supports establishing a county library system. The Oregon Environmental Council rated his voting record on environmental issues while a state legislator as nearly perfect. He worked as a member of the Lane Transit District board to extend service to rural Lane County. Craig is the progressive voice needed on the board to replace Elliott.

On the GOP side, Andy Maxon, a local realtor, is running unopposed.

Postpone expenditures

One of the more promising developments in the struggle for a quality minority/low-income program is the passage of a faculty resolution calling for the establishment of a planning committee composed of faculty, students and minority representatives. This action is a significant breakthrough in that it recognizes the validity of minority and student opinion in making judgments about the direction a minority program should take.

The history of former programs is rich with controversy, filled to the brim with promises made and broken, raised expectations and dashed hopes, arbitrary action by white administrators, closed and sudden decision-making, poorly conceived goals, no evaluation procedures and disregard of student, minority and sympathetic faculty opinion.

It would be a mistake to assume the planning committee will have an easy row to hoe, but at least it is a step in the right direction. Many names of sympathetic faculty, student, and community representatives have been suggested as members of the planning committee and there is no reason to assume that the committee will beget their ideas in ignorance, nor is there reason to assume that their deliberations will take until next spring.

For the first time, a consensus seems to be emerging from blacks, Chicanos, Asians, Native Americans and low-income whites regarding the structure of a program that would be acceptable to all concerned.

It appears that decisions are now being made which seriously undermine the planning committee. At a May 3 meeting of an ad hoc ethnic/minority committee, John Baldwin, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and the person designated by President Boyd to provide direction and leadership for minority programs, announced that the bulk of the budget for next year's program has already been committed!

An inkling of the intended direction of the Academic Opportunities Program comes from a memo which was recently sent to departments from the Director of AOP. The memo indicated AOP's intention to sponsor special sections of courses "which introduce the core concepts specific to the funded department" and which reserves "at least 20-30 per cent of the available slots for non-AOP students." After apologizing for "not getting this information to you earlier," the memo instructs the departments to decide if they want to participate, and to telephone the AOP central office, submit objectives of proposed courses, the names of the people chosen to teach the courses and the cost involved. This sounds to us like freebee money, handed out in a most unaccountable manner.

We respectfully suggest that any money that has been given to any department be returned to AOP and that any proposal submitted be withdrawn until a more appropriate time. This is not to say that special courses may not be appropriate,

but if no care is given to the content, no attention paid to the wishes of minority people, no concern for evaluation, then we can only conclude that the money is being given to pad departments in the College of Liberal Arts in a time of financial worry. This is hardly a responsible manner in which to allocate money that is clearly intended for minority disadvantaged programs.

If any academic development fund for 1975-76 is to be spent on skill development, we strongly urge that money be spent to expand the course offerings at the Center for Self-Development, as the Center has proven its sensitivity and effectiveness in dealing with minority students. Giving money to departments that may very well be used to pay GTF's who are green behind the ears but interested in a special course section, is a far cry from giving money to a program that has existed for five years and has developed expertise in the area of minority education.

Another decision is occurring which is cause for alarm. It appears that a decision is being made to extend for one full year the AOP central office staff and to bolster its office with an assistant director. It should be pointed out that these positions were made on a temporary basis, that none of these staff positions followed the normal search procedures or even a public announcement of job openings. No student input, no faculty input, no minority input was solicited during the development of job descriptions or in the hiring process. In a report submitted to President Boyd last July, Gerald Bogan, vice-president for student affairs, recommended that the central office be eliminated. In his judgment, the central office "served a need at one point in the evolution of our response to special population's needs, but is no longer justified...The expenditure for funds for this function is not justified." We believe this statement was true then and is true now more than ever. We believe that the employment contracts were clearly supposed to end as of June 1976 and should end as of June 1976.

It is our contention that any money allocated from next year's budget should be used to support the efforts of the planning group and not to employ staff of a central office who may very well act in direct opposition to the recommendations of the planning group.

We suggest that you write or call President Boyd's office (ext. 3036) expressing your support for the planning group and urging that expenditures for next year's program be postponed until a formal review procedure is established.

Concerned Faculty
E.D. Ebbighausen
Barre Toelken
John Sherwood
Edwin Coleman

Jim Bernau
ASUO pres.

Jamie Burns
IFC chair

and 20 co-signers

Letters

Incredibly strong

In the four years that I have known Jan Oliver, I have been consistently amazed by her energy and effectiveness in dealing with her own life and at the same time being responsive and responsible in dealing with both friends and co-workers. A person who can drive across the country alone, pregnant, with two young children, establish herself and her children in a new community, successfully enroll in a major University, and become a highly involved and resourceful participant in the functioning of her new school and community, has got to be an incredibly strong and resilient human being.

But the major concerns of the presidential campaign are not a person's personal life, but her/his ability to handle the duties of the office, and her/his stand on the issues. Jan has proven her abilities as an intelligent, able decision-maker during her term on the IFC.

Regarding the issues, there are a number of reasons I support Jan. She is a woman who sup-

ports issues important to women on this campus: she supports child care and has defended the Women's Referral and Resource Center at IFC hearings. She has proven an extremely effective program advocate in her position on the IFC. She obviously is in a position to understand both the problems and potential women have in academic life. Jan has demonstrated her support for ACT (Amazon Cooperating Tenants), and thus the fiscal feasibility of cooperatives by accepting an invitation to meet with and hear the concerns of ACT members at a recent meeting. Jim Davis was invited to the same meeting, but did not attend.

Jan is also knowledgeable and involved in many other levels of student affairs. But what to me is extremely important in this particular campaign is Jan's openness to all students. She refuses to jump on the present administration's bandwagon and endorse the legislative lobbying/unionization emphasis promoted by the executive until she hears substantial proof that this issue is the stu-

dents', and not manufactured by the in-group at the executive office. Student government has consisted more or less of an elite group on this campus for too long. Jim Davis is the chosen candidate of the present administration, and as a result his campaign is very slick. He has worked in the ASUO executive for four years. I contend that his perspective could hardly be as broad, nor his attitudes and policies as fresh and open as those of his opponent.

I believe the students at this University deserve real representation and advocacy by a candidate truly responsive to their needs and concerns. One who will be both approachable and innovative, and who still has the experience and ability required to perform the duties of the office.

I urge you to vote for Jan Oliver, the only candidate with these qualities and qualifications.

Mary M. Gillan
Ed., grad.