

Letters

Ruthless politician

Jimmy Carter, in the write-up he submitted for the Oregon Primary Voter's Pamphlet, makes some claims about his accomplishments as governor of Georgia, and I quote: He "eliminated 278 of the state's 300 agencies", "slashed administrative costs by 50 per cent," and left "a surplus of over \$116 million in the state's treasury" at the end of his term. All sounds pretty impressive, huh?

Unfortunately, when one looks at the actual record things don't appear quite so rosy. Instead of eliminating those 278 agencies he consolidated them all into 22 superagencies with most of those original agencies becoming "divisions" of this umbrella system. Figures from the Georgia Budget Office actually indicate that funding for the agency most in charge of administration—the Governor's Office — increased 49 per cent during Carter's term. As far as I know Carter has never substantiated his figure. The Georgia State Auditor's Office reports that Carter left a surplus all right, but of only \$43,135,552—not nearly the \$116 million that Carter quotes. Even more interesting to note, however, is the fact that when Carter came into office there was already a surplus of \$90,950,096 in the treasury. This means that in the course of his term as governor there was a net depletion from the treasury of \$47,814,544.

Although Carter's assertions might not technically be lies (or, for that matter, that unusual for a politician), such misrepresentations are rather disturbing for a "born-again Christian" and a candidate whose principal issues are honesty and integrity. In fact, his performance to date—from the distorting of his governor's record to his two-faced behavior on key issues to his staff's vicious smear campaign against writer Steven Brill (see May, *Harper's*)—clearly demonstrates that he is one of the most ruthless politicians to hit the big time since Tricky Dick went into an early retirement.

Ralph Waldo Emerson once said, "The louder he spoke of his honor, the quicker we counted the spoons."

Tim Sylwester
computer sci., sr.

Damage done

Last Friday my opponent, David Parr, submitted a letter to the Emerald signed by himself and accusing me of slander, libel, misrepresentation, overspending, violating spending laws, corrupt campaigning and irresponsible issue statements. He then threatened to file slander charges unless I publicly apologized for these alleged illegal actions. Why did Mr. Parr make such damaging accusations without backing them up by actual charges? I have a right to face my accuser. My campaign has been one of honesty in focusing on the issues, of careful analysis in detailing the current situation on the Incidental Fee Committee and of openness in offering viable solutions to the difficulties I have discovered. I have never made untruthful or misleading statements concerning my opponent, nor have I violated any campaign laws as alleged by Mr. Parr.

Although I'm confident of my own innocence, I feel a moral obligation to prove my innocence in a public forum. The trust that my supporters, voting constituency and contributors have put in my Oregon Daily Emerald

character has been violated by Mr. Parr's false accusations. Due to the timing of his letter, any damage done to my campaign is now irreversible; however, the damage to my character is not.

On Friday I filed a campaign complaint against Mr. Parr for making unsubstantiated, libelous accusations against myself and my campaign. Hopefully my case will be heard tonight. In the public arena of the elections court, I expect to set the record straight.

I ask everyone to join me after this election in a drive to establish an ethics commission to govern the ASUO elections. I also wish to make a public apology, not for any past actions, but for any delay in the release of election results caused by the action I am now undertaking.

Dave Tyler
IFC candidate

Won't forget

Doug Melevin, candidate for county commissioner, is a local example of that new philosophy emerging in the Democratic party that believes government exists to help and to educate people as well as to govern them. To accomplish this he supports decentralizing political power. Only then can government know and meet the needs of the people.

Doug will actively work to pass the nuclear safeguards ballot measure. Should this fail, he will work to pass a law prohibiting the construction of nuclear power plants in Lane County.

The present commissioner claims to support county recycling efforts, yet she has failed to provide the money necessary to operate BRING, a local non-profit volunteer recycling effort. Doug will see that BRING is properly funded.

Doug Melevin has always been a strong supporter of land use planning and the Willamette Greenway system. In addition, Doug is a man of conviction. Some years ago, when running for district attorney, he had the guts to support the decriminalization of marijuana when it was still an unpopular issue.

Unlike his opponents, Doug has taken the time to come up to the campus and discuss the issues with us. When he is elected, he won't forget us.

Kent Anderson
David Jennings
Students for Melevin

Question put

We are concerned about the future of environmental recycling programs which promote home separation as one viable alternative to the solid waste problem. Since BRING is the organization in Lane County attempting to make source separation workable we put to several county commissioner candidates the question "Do you support continued or increased funding of BRING?"

Candidate Doug Melevin is the only one in the position one race to support increased funding and make recycling education part of his campaign platform. Incumbent Nancy Hayward says she supports BRING but refused to commit herself to increased funding. This smacks of tokenism considering her support of the Glenwood capital-intensive garbage receiving station project costing several million dollars while BRING subsists on a meager \$10,000 a year. Archie Weinstein says the county

should stay out of the garbage business altogether.

For the position three commissioner spot Jack Craig is the only candidate that supports BRING. Jack has a proven environmental record from his term in the 1971 Legislature supporting the bottle bill and the field burning ban. Incumbent Frank Elliott wants to cut county services with BRING high on his list.

The county commissioners will make the vital decision concerning the future of BRING's environmental recycling program. Environmentally conscious voters should support Doug Melevin for position one and Jack Craig for position three in next Tuesday's Democratic primary elections.

Jeff Warren
geography, fr.

Vote ensures

I would like to firmly support Jim Davis for ASUO president. His expertise and experience are factors which drastically outweigh his opponent's qualities. Jim Davis has been deeply involved in every facet of student association, a fact very few can claim.

During the past year I have worked in the ASUO executive as administrative assistant for academic affairs. Few have been more concerned with the progress of this "University and Academic Affairs" sector than Jim Davis. He found time among his many duties as vice president for program administration and finance to keep fully informed and active in University affairs. A look at Jim's position on the issues makes his knowledge evident.

Jim Davis stands for consumer's guide to classes, a publication begun this year which aids literally thousands of students in making curriculum decision at no cost.

He stands for faculty/course evaluation release, an issue which the ASUO executive has sought all year. We are finally close to achieving the release of this important information. With Jim's experience and expertise we can achieve the goal in a very short time.

He stands for placement of students on promotion and tenure committees. It's about time students took a more commanding role in the hiring, firing and promotion of faculty. This is another issue which we are close to achieving and with Jim's knowledge we can do it.

I feel the choice is clear. A vote for Davis is a vote which will ensure continued gains in the student role. Vote for Davis and protect your rights.

Peter C. Spratt
ASUO administrative assistant
for academic affairs

Knows resources

The recent ASUO primary election resulted in a victory for what the ASUO is about. Two candidates espousing strong and professional student advocacy from the ASUO executive garnered a clear majority over supporters of a de-activated ASUO. As IFC chair I have worked closely with both Jan Oliver and Jim Davis. Both are brilliant and competent

people, deeply committed to the needs of the students of the University of Oregon.

The ASUO executive office has three distinct tasks: administering and helping the 60 agencies of the ASUO, working for student issues at the State Legislature and acting as an advocate for all students with the University administration and the State Board of Higher Education. With strong and experienced leadership, the ASUO can affect the student's goals in all these arenas.

I support Jim Davis in his bid for the ASUO presidency. Jim Davis has had substantive experience in dealing with the University bureaucracy. He has spent time at the Oregon State Legislature, and has five years of experience in various ASUO programs. He has proven to be an efficient organizer and an effective manager; Jim always has a good conception of what his resources are and where they are going. To ensure an immediately effective ASUO executive for next year, please vote for Jim Davis.

Jamie Burns
IFC chairer

Water pistols

We've heard a lot of criticism of Jim Davis lately. Most will reject those claims of similarity to Nixon or concerning the trivia of "improperly" canvassing private residences. Prevalent though, are assumptions that Davis, in his relationship to the present ASUO, typifies an ineffective elite of junior politicians who refuse to communicate with their own people — students.

Ineffectiveness is not just characteristic of ASUO. Every student government faces the same problem, as all they ever were meant to be was ineffective. Administrations gave us student "governments" that practice futility only in order to appease us with concessions which should have been made long ago with no sweat off their backs. And why would students take an interest in or communicate with student government unless their sole immediate goal was more candy machines (a Baskin-Robbins) in the EMU. To fault ASUO for its progress and minimal student input is not placing the burden where it belongs. It's like demanding the ASUO executive approach Johnson Hall with empty water pistols and smiles while you hide in the bushes yelling "pull your triggers dummies."

It's hard to separate Jim Davis from "more of the same" connotations, but let's look at his main issue — collective bargaining. Equated with student unionization, it means student government must be able to bargain all student concerns, in the way of a union negotiating a contract. This idea conceives students as consumers with the right to bargain for the services we receive, to set realistic grievance procedures, to determine the amount of tuition we will pay. It goes beyond the mere voice to the legitimate negotiator. By pushing this issue, Davis shows not that he believes in "more of the same," but that realistic progress won't be made without a change in technique. Jan Oliver on the other hand implies that she opposes the concept of collective bargaining, that

strong lobbying efforts and attempts to communicate better with students will make the difference. Here's really "more of the same." Communications will only improve when the ASUO is worth communicating with, when effectiveness becomes visible beyond merely implementing programs like SEARCH and ESCAPE. As far as Oliver's lobbying plans, what will she be lobbying for?

Jim Davis has not been so vague, nor does he refuse to recognize the real issues at stake. He is the first to admit ASUO's weaknesses, yet is innovative enough to seek new directions toward achievement of student goals. In this light, I hope you will support Jim Davis and the collective bargaining referendum.

Karl Koerper
pol. sci., jr.

Level headed

I first met Jim Davis through a community project involving the elderly in which we both participated. I was impressed then with his genuine concern for people and his sensitivity toward the needs of others.

But even more significant was his ability to address problems in a practical and forthright manner, and his willingness to work hard to get things done.

Jan Oliver seems to be capable and well-meaning, and some of the criticisms of her (like the fact that she has three children) are downright silly. Undoubtedly, she would do a good job.

But at a time when student government is viewed with suspicion or outright disdain by the small percentage of students who even recognize its existence, it seems important to have a student body president who exhibits compassion and leadership ability. I think Jim Davis would best utilize the practical tools available to him.

One more thing. When the kiddies started kicking the sand around the sandbox two weeks ago, Davis handled the situation swiftly and responsibly. While others overreacted to the ridiculousness of the whole thing, Jim Davis kept a level head. And by doing so, he truly exhibited his fine character.

Spencer W. Alpert
interdisciplinary studies, grad.

Playing games

What's going on with this Izzy fellow? He says that he represents those who don't care about the ASUO, and yet he seems to be trying very hard to influence this election. What gives? Is it possible that Izzy has been playing games with the students all along in a scheme to get Jan Oliver elected as president?

I would suggest that if students are truly unhappy with student governments, they should support Jim Davis, the candidate who is seeking to overhaul the ASUO into an effective association which protects tuition dollars and works to provide a quality education for its members. Davis' opponent stands for little more than the old, tired sandbox politics days of student government.

Jeff DeBois
psych., soph.