

Elect Warren, Feldman

Voters in Wednesday and Thursday's ASUO runoff election face a tough choice between two qualified, energetic candidates for a vacant position on the Incidental Fee Committee. The two candidates, Jeff Warren and Scott Bassett, hold similar views on most issues, and either one could probably do the job. A few differences, however, are enough to make Warren the superior candidate.

Warren's experience on the Student University Affairs Board has proven his commitment to student government. More than most of his fellow SUAB members, Warren has taken his position seriously and has emerged as one of the chief workhorses of the often ignored but potentially powerful SUAB. A capacity for hard and unrewarding work is an important qualification for an IFC member, and Warren has demonstrated that capacity.

Both Warren and Bassett feel that efficiency in program expenditures can keep the IFC from having to choose between raising the incidental fee and cutting programs. Both are clearly in favor of strong minority programs. And neither thinks students are getting a fair deal from the Athletic Department. But Warren is a little more specific when it comes to ways of getting things done.

The worst thing about electing Warren will be that Bassett has to lose. Bassett should spend the next few months learning his way around student government — he's done a lot of homework already — and run for the IFC again in November. In the meantime, Jeff Warren should be elected to fill the vacant IFC position.

Of course, voters are chiefly concerned with the race for the office of ASUO President. Last week students had to express their preference for one candidate among several who were acceptable, and more students chose Gary Feldman than any of the others. This week the alternatives are more clear, and Feldman is still the best candidate.

Feldman promises an open administration, and, just as important, an effective one. He is sensitive to the concerns of minorities. He will work to develop a strong legislative program. He has ideas on how students can gain greater control of the EMU. His positions relating to the Athletic Department and the University administration are aggressive but tempered with realism. He is clearly the best candidate on the runoff election ballot and should be made our next ASUO President.

Allow write-in effort

Craig Geary, write-in candidate for ASUO President, learned Monday morning that there would be no space for write-ins on the ASUO ballot and that votes for him would not be counted. It has been decided that write-in candidates, according to the ASUO Constitution, are not allowed in the runoff election. That decision, and the way it was made, seems unfair to Geary.

The ASUO Constitution says that the ASUO President must be elected by a majority of the votes cast. If no candidate receives a majority, a runoff election must be held between the two candidates receiving the most votes. On these constitutional grounds, Geary's write-in candidacy has been disallowed.

But the Constitution says nothing about write-in candidates. Nor does it say that only one runoff election may be held. The ASUO Constitution is vague on the question of write-ins, and Geary, who has spent a considerable amount of time and money on his campaign, is having to suffer for it.

The question came up in a peculiar manner. Geary placed third in last week's primary election and notified the ASUO Friday of his intention to continue his campaign as a write-in candidate. Over the weekend it was decided that the ASUO Constitution Committee would probably rule Geary's candidacy invalid if the question came before it. So Geary has been barred from the ballot by a decision that is predicated on a ruling that hasn't been made, but is only thought likely to be made. And Geary spent the weekend planning and preparing for a race in which he will not be allowed to participate.

If the ASUO Constitution Committee were to decide that write-ins aren't allowed in a runoff election, that decision would be final. But the exact constitutional status of Geary's campaign is in doubt. Since Geary wasn't informed from the start that there may be constitutional problems with his candidacy, he should be given the benefit of the doubt and his candidacy should be allowed, pending a final determination by the Constitution Committee.

ASUO candidate's forum

For Tyler

Both candidates for ASUO President voted almost exactly alike on the Greek budget, but that's where the similarity ends. Dave Tyler is the candidate who best represents the needs and concerns of the students. It's not surprising that the Emerald attacks him at every opportunity. After all, he stands for such horrible things as fiscal conservatism but liberal activism, a student voice in governing our University, continued support and development of ASUO cultural and minority programs, enfranchising the majority of the student body now "left out" by the ASUO, and even goes so far as to propose an open office with every Friday afternoon set aside for people to walk in, talk, listen, question, or bitch. With dangerous ideas like these, it's amazing they let him loose on the streets.

Dave Tyler will be an aggressive voice for student concerns. Not a word came out of the ASUO on Boyd's CSPA and library cuts. Tyler will push for a student voice in deciding tenure, promotion, curriculum, tuition, budgeting, budget cuts, the housing office, health fee, building fee and Amazon cooperating tenants.

His support of an EMU Tavern and EMU Credit Union will help that building finally break even, and maybe even turn a profit. We can't be afraid to take a step forward. Dave Tyler's ideas are an innovative step for the ASUO. As long as a majority of the students are disenfranchised, the ASUO will never be able to effectively advocate for student concerns.

Tyler's opponent, Gary Feldman, calls for a new direction, but it's Dave Tyler who truly offers a new direction. More of the same means an unreached student body and an unrepresentative student government. Vote Dave Tyler for ASUO President this Wednesday and Thursday. He represents a strong voice for student concerns.

**Jon Teague
Mike Kehoe
ASUO-SUAB
Research Assistants**

For Osborn

The Student University Affairs Board (SUAB) is our representation before the faculty and administration. Our role in determining University policy depends upon the strength of our SUAB.

Too few students are aware of the SUAB and its functions; students should know that we have a collective voice in the administration. I think the SUAB can in-

crease its effectiveness through greater visibility. The SUAB must have student support and awareness.

I seek SUAB position #2 because I am concerned about the critical issues we are now facing. I support greater student input regarding budget cut decisions. I support public disclosure of faculty evaluations (and favor HB 2702, now in the Oregon Senate, which would allow just that).

I personally want to retain the present quarter system, but should a majority of students indicate that they want a semester system, I think we should seriously consider it.

The SUAB has a potential that has not been reached. With greater responsiveness to students I believe its role in University co-governance will be strong and decisive.

I am committed to responsive and assertive representation. I urge all journalism and speech majors to vote in the general elections in recognition of the SUAB's importance in University affairs.

Feel free to all me at 342-1051 with questions and comments.

**Kell Osborn
SUAB candidate - position #2**

For Tyler

Why don't students vote? A turnout of 11 per cent is disgusting for a supposedly activist campus. I think that the low turnout is explained by the fact that a vast majority of the student body feels disenfranchised from the ASUO. They simply aren't being reached. Diversity is important, and as ASUO President I will work to expand the scope of our programs, but until we reach the alienated majority of the student body, the ASUO will remain a weak voice for student advocacy. This is our University — it's here for our sake — and we should have a major voice in how it is governed. The energy of the ASUO directed toward academic issues, concerns, and problems will serve to enfranchise a great many more students. As ASUO President my priorities will be:

- 1) Student participation in all University decisions which effect us.
- 2) Major objectives of holding down tuition, EMU Tavern, EMU Student Credit Union, Student Bill of Rights.
- 3) Development of an effective guide to ASUO programs and services.
- 4) Development and support of the Student University Affairs Board, our "foot in the door" in University co-governance.
- 5) Diversified programs for a di-

versified student body. Our cultural and minority programs must be protected to insure the educational balance of the University.

6) An aggressive voice for student concerns.

Through an open office, an open mind and a responsive administration, the ASUO can once again represent the vast majority of students currently disenfranchised from the government they paid for.

Low voter turnout hurts everyone. When the ASUO President testifies in Salem against the tuition increase, a frequent response is, "who's to say you really represent the students when you were elected by only 6 percent of the student body?" Please take the two minutes necessary to vote on Wednesday or Thursday. Only by applying itself to the larger issues of the University can the ASUO extricate itself from the immobilizing bog of student apathy and derision. I ask for your vote as a commitment to these priorities.

**Dave Tyler
Candidate for ASUO President**

Write in Geary

In the three years I have been a student here I have yet to see a truly different student government offered.

Every year the ASUO president has come from somewhere within the ASUO/IFC hierarchy. The social club that inhabits Suite 4 carries on in an unbroken chain of elites — never much disturbing the status quo.

That's what makes me admire Craig Geary's campaign. Not only because I agree with his platform, but for his determination. He's still willing to fight when it's obvious that only about 1/10 of the student population is willing to vote. (Except within that nebulous Greek political machine that mobilized almost all of its students.)

Admittedly I'm not always thinking about the fact that almost half my tuition goes into the ASUO. But I am now.

With that much of my money, I certainly feel I should be able to expect more than Feldman or Tyler will offer. The only budget that has their dynamic support is the Greek budget.

I don't want to fund the well-off Greeks and leave other financially less well-off students (including myself) wanting.

I want more.

Don't you?

That's why I am going to write in Craig Geary for ASUO president.

**George W. Braddock
Senior — Political Science**

Letter

Protest rent hike

How does almost a 100 per cent rent increase over four years sound? (\$42.50 to \$80.) That's what Amazon housing project residents face next July if yet another \$10 increase proposed Monday by the University Housing Office is approved by the state board. If this smacks of *deja vu* to some of you, it is. One year ago the Amazon rent was raised \$10 after the residents agreed not to strike or speak before the state board. In exchange, the University agreed to tenant management of Amazon if a study indicated its "feasibility." A year of such study has gone by with almost no cooperation from the University. As one University administrator is re-

ported to have summarized, "We committed that ACT (Amazon Community Tenants) tenant management proposal to death."

However, one concrete conclusion which emerged from the months of resident research was that the Housing Office has no valid justification for any increase from the present \$70 rent, given the residents' desire for the services provided. For example, the Housing Office now is arguing that residents must pay more for traffic safety. In light of the \$1.50 rent increase proposed for Westmoreland Housing Project, the \$10 increase for Amazon may be viewed as yet another reflection of the vindictive attitude toward "those Amazon students" who not only question Housing Office policies on maintenance (over expensive), health and safety (irresponsible) and community development ("Let's study recycling

and stonewall it"). Worse still, those residents have the gall to suggest that Amazon tenant management and autonomy would be better for Amazon and for the University community.

What to do? 1. Join our protest march on the Housing Office assembling today at 11:30 a.m. sharp in front of the library. 2. Be at the May 17 rent increase proposal hearing in the EMU where we let the state board know. 3. Letters to Dean Lallas (State Board of Higher Ed., Johnson Hall) who will likely be presiding at the hearing. 4. If you live in Amazon, investigate your legal right to pay your rent to a separate authorized bank account, a bargaining tool for getting the University to take us seriously. (See your ACT rep for details.)

**David Zupan
Amazon Community Tenants**

Tuesday, May 3, 1977