

Letters

CSPA successful

I was very disappointed to learn that the University is cutting the School of Community Service and Public Affairs' budget by almost 50 per cent.

I am pursuing an M.S. in Interdisciplinary Studies, with CSPA as one of my major departments or schools. Naturally, I am concerned about the quality of the courses which will be taught in the future.

However, I am more concerned with the impact this decision is going to have on social progress here in Eugene and elsewhere. CSPA students have been extremely active in the affairs of neighborhood groups, social service agencies, the City of Eugene, Lane County and other public institutions. I know because I'm constantly running into CSPA people in the community. Conversely, resource people from these institutions have been extremely involved with CSPA.

I wonder if the University fully realizes how much of an effect schools like CSPA have had in giving liberal arts-oriented students an opportunity to achieve practical goals in their communities.

The Emerald article said CSPA enrollments are going up. Then why doesn't President Boyd take the axe to other schools or departments which have not been so successful?

Bill Seavey
Graduate Student —
Interdisciplinary Studies

Trip questionable

I want to comment on ASUO spending in the light of having read a proposal to abolish that organization in your opinion column. While honoring use of students' funds for such groups as OSPIRG, Child Care, for example, I am personally concerned to enrich the cultural life of this community. However eugenic it is, the campus community doesn't even have the cultural advantages of, say, Portland State.

Our campus and civic cultural groups offer us a great deal; but I'm greedy, mainly for the students, and want more funds to go into supporting performers of international stature in dance, theater and music. While honoring the

rightness of having students decide how to spend their funds, I submit that their image of cultural possibilities is relatively limited in general.

From a strictly musical standpoint, my personal image is of balancing three repertoires each year: the oral traditions of the world, bluegrass, raga, shakuhachi and jazz, for example; the "avant-garde" with its electronics and passionate theatrical madnasses; and the "classic" tradition, from Gregorian Chant to Bartok and Stravinsky.

This seems to be a stillborn maverick point of view from both sides. In seeking support, I called to talk with Cultural Forum concert-bookers. They are unavailable, attending an "entertainment convention in Dallas, Texas, this week."

Is that junket at personal expense, or from students' fee money...?

Robert Trotter
Professor — Music

Let them eat cake

Last Week President Boyd quietly lifted his little red pencil and drew a great big line through the School of Community Service and Public Affairs. Nothing serious, mind you, he only eliminated one half of the CSPA budget.

When someone dared to question his action, Boyd peels off the comment, "People not pleased with a decision will always quarrel over the process by which that decision was made."

I can't see how anyone with such a smug and sarcastic attitude is fit to be the president of a university in a democratic society.

Few consumers have as little control over what they pay for than students. Few workers have less influence within their work situations than teachers. Must we wait until every progressive, democratic program at the University of Oregon has been eliminated before we realize that the only people fit to run this school are ourselves — teachers and students?

I understand that President Boyd is making a special order of cake — to be served at a later date.

Will Roscoe
Junior — CSPA



"...AND THIS IS FREDDIE, MR. PRESIDENT... HE'D LIKE TO SAY HELLO, TOO. SAY 'HELLO', FREDDIE..."

Curriculum unique

Regarding Terrence Hines' opinion column of Thursday, Feb. 17: I am truly amazed at the magnitude of misleading and erroneous information conveyed by Mr. Hines concerning the purpose, operation and funding of the SEARCH program.

Mr. Hines' argument for the elimination of compulsory fees has lost all credibility by his demonstration of total ignorance in regards to the programs and organizations cited in his article. Perhaps Mr. Hines could benefit from a review of ethics when gathering his information in the future.

Mr. Hines has incorrectly assumed that the specialized classes taught through SEARCH are not in the regular course offerings because there is not enough student interest. Indeed, he has missed the entire purpose of the SEARCH program. SEARCH was created in response to the students' desire to have an active role in the development of their curriculum. Without the students who make class requests, teach and enroll in the classes, this program would fold over night. SEARCH classes are experimental and innovative in nature, and as such are unique in the students' curriculum here at the University.

The suggestion of creating a Free University has little merit, since the students have demon-

strated repeatedly their lack of enthusiasm for non-credit classes.

For the record, 37 per cent of our entire budget covered salaries and operating expenses including telephone, postage and office supplies. 66 per cent of the budget went directly to our classes in the form of printing, audio-visual, reference materials and set-up.

Every year we use a zero-based budgeting procedure which insures that every program is evaluated on its productivity and service to the students rather than its longevity or size. I believe this is a fair system that does not sacrifice efficiency or responsiveness to the student populace.

Ruyle Spiller
Director — SEARCH

Valuable insight

I just want to commend your paper, and particularly writer Kathy Craft, for the very fine article recently on Rick Williams, a gay student-parent. It was sensitively written, and focused on a situation within the University and our society concerning which most of us need more such helpful, insightful information. This article does much to promote appreciation and understanding of gays through a personal and positive glimpse into the life of a gay person who is also struggling to be the best parent he can. However one may feel about the gay issue, your article has added a helpful new perspective to the discussion. That, to me, is

journalism at its best!

My thanks, also, to Rick Williams for his "openness" in sharing his life in order to further our understanding!

Norman Metzler
Campus Christian Ministry

Window dressing

The recent controversy concerning the cover over the downtown mall is not dealing with the broader issues. The support of the architecture department (by means of offering design proposals) is doing nothing more than compounding the problem. A bandaid approach. If the architecture department, or anyone, wanted to "help" the situation downtown, they should have given strong support to the groups who opposed the rezoning (three years ago) of the Valley River Center. It was this rezoning that allowed for expansion of Valley River Center and subsequent exodus from downtown. The real issue is not whether or not to cover the mall, but a closer look at what factors lead to the current conditions. Part of the current "condition" is that there has been, and still exists, a lack of an attitude about what the mall should, or could, be. Support of the Architecture department at its current level will be nothing more than window dressing, and not shop cleaning.

Henry C. Kunowski
Senior — Architecture

opinion

Open primary enfranchises Independents

At the turn of the century, Oregon helped establish a national precedent by creating one of the first primary election systems in the country.

Today, 70 years later, there's a growing movement to further democratize this Oregon tradition with a "crossover" open primary.

The crossover system is a revolutionary proposal that would allow registered Independent, Democrat and Republican voters the privilege to vote for whomever they choose, regardless of party labels, in the May primary election.

Despite surveys which show high voter approval (Bardsley and Oregon Research polls) the open primary concept has met determined opposition from the state Democratic Party, which presently controls both houses of the legislature and helped defeat an open primary bill (HB2262) in the 1975 legislature.

Democratic objections center — above all else — on the fear that de-emphasizing party labels via an open primary will work to the advantage of the minority party, the Republicans.

Other critics contend that the de-emphasization of party labels would weaken Oregon's already puny party structures.

Still another criticism, held equally by Republicans, is the fear of "raiding," a process by which voters select the weakest candidate of the opposition party, who will be the easiest to defeat in the November general election.

All in all, Democrats see nothing to gain from an open primary and, possibly, a great deal to lose. Many Republicans, in contrast, see it as a god send rescuing them from perpetual minority status.

Page 4

This is the greatest misconception of the open primary: The belief that it's going to "help" or "hurt" either political party.

Democrats, in particular, have nothing to fear in terms of political damage at the ballot box. Democratic misgivings of an open primary aiding Republicans just have not been substantiated in Washington and Alaska where crossover systems have flourished for years. In both of these states Democrat strength is solid and shows no signs of eroding.

Furthermore, both parties — but particularly Democrats — exaggerate the degree of "loyalty" the electorate holds towards political parties. Most voters become Democrats or Republicans for shallow or non-intellectual reasons. Frequently, their party registration merely reflects that of their parents. This partisan identity is not strongly held by the majority of voters and is illustrated every two years by the heavy cross-ticket voting in the general election.

Nor would an open primary weaken the state's party structures. This, particularly, is a dubious argument since most Oregonians are rather suspicious of the "strong-party" systems in other states, traditionally fueled by patronage and corruption.

This writer believes that Oregonians value our "weak," informal, volunteer-oriented parties precisely as they are. Even if one assumed the "undesirability" of a weak party system, there's no evidence in Washington or Alaska that party deterioration has occurred.

The Washington experience should also lessen fears of open primary "raiding", corrupting the integrity of election results. The pattern has been for voters to cross

over to candidates and then continue supporting them through the general election. Republicans have crossed over to Scoop Jackson, Democrats to Dan Evans.

Turning away from the criticisms of the open primary, there are several compelling reasons for its enactment.

- The present closed primary effectively locks out 110,000 Independent voters from participation. These Independents pay taxes to support the primary election costs and their non-suffrage is, in effect, "taxation without participation."

- Gallup and Harris polls have indicated that over 40% of the electorate (in Oregon this approximates half a million people) would prefer to register "Independent" if given a choice. In Oregon, four-fifths of these have been forced to join a party against their wishes to retain their primary ballot.

- A Bardsley poll taken last year showed a 86% public approval of the open primary. This impressive support comes from 88% of the Democratic rank and file, 83% of the Republicans and nearly 100% of the Independent and "miscellaneous" registered voters. Another poll, by the Oregon Research Institute, showed a 83% endorsement of the open primary.

State Rep. David Frohnmayer, an open primary advocate has said: "No reform is without risks. But any political system which insists on locking out increasing numbers of independent-minded citizens, and which frustrates the traditional and justified instincts of Oregonians to vote for persons rather than parties is in need of reform."

Mark Kirchmeier
Senior — Journalism

Tuesday, February 22, 1977