

End IFC overspending

ASUO politics come alive in the springtime, or at least they are animated by energies that give them a lively appearance. Part of the excitement is caused by the fact that a lot of money is changing hands, money that comes directly out of students' pockets — \$1.3 million of it.

This money is divided among 44 ASUO organizations and several student-subsidized operations such as the EMU and the Athletic Department. There's a springtime scramble for funding: every group on campus wants a bigger slice of the pie.

This year it looks as though the Incidental Fee Committee (IFC), the ASUO agency with funding authority roughly analogous to that of Congress, is handing out money so fast that it is in violation of the ASUO Constitution.

So far in the IFC's budget hearings, programs have been allocated nine per cent more money than is expected to come into the ASUO coffers next year. The ASUO Constitution limits overbudgeting to seven per cent.

It's not hard to find instances of overspending that could have been avoided. The Interfraternity Council was given \$610 to allow members to attend a two-day conference in Reno, and Panhellenic received \$512 for the same purpose. One wonders whether the Greeks would be interested in attending the same conference if it were held in Medford.

Moreover, the IFC accepted what sounds like a lame excuse for Panhellenic's extravagant use of office supplies: the sorority group said it needed to use nearly 18,000 sheets of paper to preserve its good image with alumni. Combined, the Interfraternity Council and Panhellenic received \$3,100 more than last year's budget.

Despite the fact that declining enrollment is expected to force a five per cent reduction in the total ASUO budget, nearly every program that has passed before the IFC to date has received as much or more than it received last year. There are a few notable exceptions: the Native American Student Union, the Chinese Student Association, and a few others have had their budgets cut.

The IFC is now wondering what to do about its profligate overspending. The options currently being discussed are to either reconsider the allocations already made, or to slog through what remains of the allocation process and adjust program budgets across the board by whatever percentage is constitutionally and fiscally necessary.

The first option, to reconsider the allocations made so far, seems the fairest. The IFC should start its budgeting process with an idea of how much money it has to spend; it's not fair to the programs that come later for the IFC to suddenly discover that it is short of cash. The IFC works hard for little but heartache, and while students should appreciate the job the IFC does, they should demand that the job be done well.



"Incidental Fee Committee agenda item number 1563: George Lincoln Rockwell Brigade, U of O division of the American Nazi Party, line item 52: Explosives, assorted small arms and weaponry, \$15,000. Any objections?"

Letters

Fiscal expediency

Statement adopted at a general meeting of the Associated Library Students April 7, 1977:

Pres. Boyd has recommended dissolving the School of Librarianship as the latest major step in his

massive budget reduction program. Recognizing the need for continuing quality education for librarianship in this region, we cannot support such a closed-door decision based on fiscal expediency. While the school can be cut with minimal disruption to the rest of the University, the effects on the library profession and lib-



rary services in the state as a whole will be major. At a time when the University is asking for state funding on the basis of the programs it offers, it seems hypocritical to cut the only accredited library school in the state without significant prior public discussion.

Lupine Youngman
Co-president—
Associated Library Students

Proud of uniform

I had doubts about writing this letter in regards to Professor McConnaughey's letter in the April 7th ODE. I do not want to engage in verbal ping pong about the merits of AFOTC.

I do, however, wish to make a point about the wearing of the uniform that seems to irritate the professor. First and foremost, I would like to say I am proud of the uniform and not because it is "pretty" as Dr. McConnaughey said, but because of what it stands for.

Having spent three years in the U.S. Navy before coming to Oregon, uniform wearing is not new to me. The uniform alone means little. The relevance is in the fact that it symbolizes the U.S. Armed Forces, a necessary part of our lives. Granted, the services have their problems, and we'd be fools not to admit it. However, the presence of problems is no reason to run and hide where no one will see us. To think that peer pressure will erase us from the streets is laughable, to say the least. True, there is a lot to be said about the power of peer pressure, but there is more to be said for individuals who stand up to peer pressure and follow their conscience. I do not feel obligated to allow peer pressure to control the decisions regarding my life. I will enter the armed services with the same attitude. No one will force me to act against my conscience. I do not lose my constitutional rights upon entering the military nor do I lose my integrity and conscience.

In conclusion I reiterate: as an American, it was my choice to enter the military and I think others should also have that choice. To take this away from me or to think you can do so by engaging in stare tactics gives me little credit as a human being.

Ronald D. Fuchs
Junior—Journalism

Fight the hike

On Friday, April 8, some interested persons gathered together to discuss the threat of the new tuition hikes and cutbacks in University programs. A committee

was formed and a petition drawn up to fight these new proposals.

We believe that these proposals are not workable solutions to problems of low enrollment and lack of monies for higher education. In fact, if this tuition hike goes into effect, enrollment will continue to go down and next year there will be yet another hike to compensate for further decreases.

It is time for everyone to come together and fight these new increases. Whether you will be forced out or able to remain as a

consumer of a 'less than quality education,' you will still be affected. Help build the struggle and beat the hikes. If they could do it in Washington we can do it in Oregon.

- 1—Sign the petition.
- 2—Talk to your friends.
- 3—Come to the meeting Thursday, 7:30 p.m. at the EMU (room to be posted).

Alberta Bunner
for the Committee
Against Tuition Hikes
and Cutbacks

opinion

Protest IBM recruiters

The situation in South Africa has received considerable coverage in the world press, including that of the U.S. The analysis presented by the press in this country, however, is not formulated to support true freedom for South African people. Instead, it constantly distorts the situation in order to encourage a type of reform that would still maintain South Africa as a haven for foreign, especially U.S., investment.

The system of apartheid in South Africa is basically a means for controlling the black population as a labor force to the advantage and profit not only of the white minority regime, but also of the multi-national corporations. Black townships, such as Soweto, serve as a labor pool which can be tapped when necessary. Those who are not needed are often shunted off to "homelands." These barren areas are supposed to support 80 per cent of the black population while they make up only 13 per cent of the land in South Africa. In addition, blacks must carry passbooks at all times, cannot own land, and must use separate and inferior facilities of all kinds. The apartheid system is designed to keep wages as low as possible and keep blacks in unskilled jobs.

There are over 350 U.S. firms with investments in South Africa; their investments have risen spectacularly in the past decade, especially in the past several years. During this time, a police state was being developed. While U.S. investment was sometimes growing as much as 20 per cent a year, 98 new discriminatory laws were passed. The truth is that the extremely low wages and sharp oppression of black people under apartheid allow these corporations to make almost double the world average rate of profit. This gives the lie to statements designed to apologize for the role multinational corporations play in a system which is being more exposed every day in its brutality and historical backwardness.

IBM is one of those corporations profiting from apartheid. Its customers include the Department of Defense; the Department of the Interior, which administers all prisons; the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, which deals with research in critical military areas; and the Atomic Energy Board. Clearly, the use to which these computers are put does not serve the interests of the South African people, but instead is used against them to keep them suppressed.

On Friday, April 15th, the University administration is welcoming IBM recruiters on campus. The University shows its complicity in the racist apartheid by providing facilities for corporations with investments in South Africa to recruit new employees. The South African Support Committee calls on all students to join a demonstration opposing IBM investment in South Africa and the presence of these corporate recruiters on campus. It will begin at 1:30 p.m. on the EMU terrace and will move to Susan Campbell Hall where the recruiters will be sharply questioned. This is a step in supporting the true liberation of South African people, which, they will gain only by ending the racist white minority regime and expelling all foreign investment from South Africa.

Myra E. Delay
Southern African Support Committee