

IFC endorsements

Once again, candidates for the Incidental Fee Committee are trying hard to drum up student support for their ideas and beliefs. The candidates who are elected Wednesday and Thursday will be spending \$1.4 million this year on programs operated by the Associated Students of the University of Oregon. Many students have never even heard of the programs, let alone the IFC. And this year, it appears that the vote will be decided again by a very small minority of the student body.

Since the IFC spend \$31 per term of your — and our — money, we take the elections seriously. After serious and in-depth interviews with all 14 candidates, we now present what we finally believe are the best seven candidates, the seven who will make up an IFC that is the best in terms of ability, energy and balance.

The field of candidates this year presents a variety of viewpoints and background. Five incumbents are seeking re-election to the committee and there are nine new faces in the race.

Of the five incumbents, we are most impressed by three: Doug Benson, Steve Herlocker and Jeff Warren.

Doug Benson now works for the EMU and sits on the EMU Board of Directors. He exhibits a fine knowledge of the EMU and its intricacies. The EMU eats about \$784,000 per year and Benson is in favor of finding ways to control that figure. He favors the idea of beginning a full-time EMU tavern, which has been viewed by many people as a way to bring more money into the EMU coffers.

Benson also supports the funding of minority groups on campus, explaining that they provide an environment for minority students and also contribute to the culture of the student body at large.

Benson also agrees with the funding of the Oregon Student Lobby, which is one of the most important student funded organizations. The OSL works for tuition cuts, child care, release of faculty evaluations and a host of other student concerns, and they do it well.

Steve Herlocker also caught our attention as one who is well qualified to overview the expenditure of student money. He is also in favor of the EMU tavern and is willing to explore the possibility of other commercial establishments. Herlockers is wary of funding organizations which may not be entirely beneficial here at the University. He shows a sharp attitude and will be a good member of the committee.

The third incumbent we would like to see return to the committee, Jeff Warren, is also wary of funding programs and in the past has been good at suggesting alternative ways of approaching a problem. He is a strong supporter of the OSL, supports a review of the criteria used for funding programs and believes the programs should be accountable to the IFC and the student body.

Perhaps the freshest of the new faces on the IFC candidates list is Kelly McKirdy. He has had some experience in student government before at a different college and shows an interest and willingness to learn and to keep an open mind here. He will be an energetic member of the committee and will actively seek student input into IFC decisions. He also favors the upgrading and streamlining of programs to make sure they are serving the purposes they are intended to serve. McKirdy also believes there should be a diversity of people on the committee, and he is the kind of person who could provide that diversity.

Another fresh breeze is Ted Walker, who facetiously says he would like to represent the apathetic students on the IFC. Considering that so few students vote in elections, Walker will have a lot of representing to do and we feel he can do it well. He feels that student's money is not now being put to optimal use and favors economizing on the IFC budget, especially in the EMU.

Walker also feels that too much money is now being put into the Athletic department, a feeling

we share completely — especially since we also have to pay for tickets. He also believes that programs should be more accountable to the IFC. Greek dominance of the IFC (last year there were five greeks and two non-greeks) bothers Walker a bit and it bothers us too. Though no real problems occurred with greek voting blocks, it seems to us that a very real potential for abuse exists on the IFC with that distribution.

Another person we feel deserves to be voted onto the IFC is Scott Bassett. Bassett has run for the position before and didn't make it. Since then, he has been researching, finding out things about the IFC and student government and we feel he is now plenty well prepared to serve the students well on the committee. One of Bassett's priorities, which we support, is the review of budget criteria and he has some good ideas on making the criteria work more effectively on the program budget decisions. And at the same time, he strikes us as one who will also keep an open mind when it comes time to divvy up the student money.

Gary Laing is another candidate we would like to see on the committee. Laing, a music student, represents a breed of students who rarely sees the inside of Suite 4. We are happy to see a non-traditional student seeking more control over how student affairs are handled. Laing is wary of duplication within the programs and is in favor of economizing the programs. He is not in favor of raising fees, but will be willing to listen to program needs and desires. He will provide an important balance on the committee.

So there they are, seven candidates we feel will do the best job of representing the students. There were others we were impressed with in some areas. Janet Eggleston seemed a likely candidate, but we were distressed by her negative views of the Oregon Student Lobby and also believed that her account of the minority programs on campus didn't take into account enough of the cultural value of those programs. We like some of her ideas, but disagreed with her in too many major areas to endorse her.

Dave Tyler, an incumbent who pursued the ASUO presidency last year, did not win our endorsement for several reasons. For one, in a letter dated January 12, 1977, Tyler said he would resign his post on the IFC at the end of his term, saying he couldn't stand the "petty politics." Since he didn't get the presidency and now wishes to retain his IFC post, we believe his motives tend to be more political than we'd like to see. He may be geared up for another shot at ASUO president and we'd rather see someone who is genuinely concerned about how student money is spent — and less in politics.

Another problem we foresee with Tyler is that he strongly supports an ASUO funded radio station. There is already one campus radio station and another might too easily become a mouthpiece of the ASUO. While it would be good to get more students aware of the programs, the cost of such a station outweighs any merit the idea has.

Another candidate we thought just didn't have it this year was Mary Gilmore. She seems sharp and open-minded, but as yet doesn't know enough about how student government works to be involved in controlling it.

Dave Hebert, an incumbent, might have the background to serve on the IFC, but we haven't agreed with his views in the past and probably wouldn't agree with them this year.

The other candidates, Jay Donaldson, Toby Barlow and Larry Hollins, don't have the background and knowledge to be effective IFC members. They need to do their homework better before they try for office.

As we said earlier, the IFC needs to be taken seriously. We feel Benson, Herlocker, Warren, McKirdy, Walker, Bassett and Laing are the best choices for the committee. But whoever you vote for, do vote. It's the best way to have control over how your money is spent.

Letters

Halpern wrong

The statement by Paul Halpern in the Nov. 1 Emerald contains a number of attacks on Dave Frohnmayer that are baseless and misdirected. 1) A state representative is not elected to represent constituents with regard to their personal legal disputes. Merely because the representative is a lawyer does not require him to be a legal advocate for each constituent. 2) It was entirely appropriate, and in fact required, for Prof. Frohnmayer to refuse to advise Halpern regarding his individual legal problems with the University. 3) There is nothing improper, despite Halpern's innuendo to the contrary, about a state representative also receiving public funds as an employee of an educational institution. The people of the state of Oregon amended the Oregon constitution in 1958 specifically to allow employees of the State Board of Higher Education and of local school boards to serve in the legislature. (See Article XV, Section 8.)

Laird Kirkpatrick
Professor of Law

More on Halpern

This letter is a comment on Paul Halpern's statement of opinion about David Frohnmayer in the Oregon Daily Emerald of Tuesday, Nov. 1.

Mr. Frohnmayer's position does not prevent him from discussing and resolving matters of general legal significance affecting students, faculty and staff within the University community. As a matter of fact, he does just that much of the time — in such important areas as equal employment opportunity, other aspects of affirmative action, student rights, grievance procedures and many other due process matters. His position, as with any lawyer who might be speaking publicly or be asked for advice, requires only that he not participate in a particular, contested case on which he later may be involved as legal counsel.

Several lawyers are members of the Oregon Legislature. Lawyer-legislators have obligations to their constituents, but no thoughtful constituent interprets that relationship as meaning that the lawyer-legislator must provide the constituent with personal legal services in a contested case, any more than a physician-legislator must provide medical services to a constituent, or an investments counselor-legislator must provide investment counseling services. I am one of Representative Frohnmayer's constituents, but I do not expect that as my elected representative he is obligated to provide me with advice or service, or to act as my lawyer on a personal matter which I may be appealing or taking to court.

The Halpern statement is written so as to suggest that Prof. Frohnmayer collects three full-time salaries at the taxpayers expense. Such an insinuation is flatly incorrect — and one would have assumed that as an LCC instructor, presumably familiar with split appointments and salary budgeting, Mr. Halpern would have been aware of and avoided such an implication. During the Legislative session, while he was on the full-time Legislative payroll, Prof. Frohnmayer was on leave without pay from the University. While on the University payroll, Professor Frohnmayer's University responsibility is divided, as it is for many faculty members. He receives a single salary from the

State Board of Higher Education — part of it budgeted internally to the Law School and part of it budgeted to Administration. Mr. Halpern's demand that Professor Frohnmayer "disclose" his salary is particularly uninformed and misleading, since University salaries have long been on public record and open to inspection. Legislative salaries are, of course, set by law and also matters of public record. If, indeed, Mr. Halpern was not aware of these salary facts I am sure that he knows that a simple phone call would have enabled him to obtain the information.

Finally, Mr. Halpern declares that "politicians must also honor the unwritten laws of political decency and morality." Mr. Halpern should know that there are very few people anywhere who measure up to this standard as well as David Frohnmayer.

Paul Olum
Provost

The tyrant Shah

In connection with the article on Shah of Iran's U.S. visit I wanted to make the following supplementary remarks. As it was pointed out, the notorious dictator, the U.S. puppet Shah of Iran will be visiting Washington D.C. on November 15 and 16, 1977.

One important aspect of this visit, as was pointed out in the previous article, is to white wash the dictatorial rule of the Shah's regime to portray this vicious tyrant as a 'humanitarian.' For this purpose, aside from their usual political publicity, the Iranian embassy in Washington and the Consulate in San Francisco are contacting people who are 'trust worthy', offering them a two way air ticket to Washington plus free hotel accommodations and a \$300 bonus for going to Washington to "welcome" the Shah. Those on governmental scholarships and those who are in training programs sponsored by the Iranian military forces are specifically asked to go. This offer has also been made to Americans. Add to the list all SAVAK (secret police) agents present in the U.S. and the special SAVAK forces which usually accompany the Shah.

Given the above factors, also taking into account the critical situation in Iran, we in the ISA (Oregon Regional Chapter) see it as important to wage a resolute struggle and expose this plot which is aimed against our people.

In answering the question regarding the reasons behind Shah's visit and its relation to American and Iranian peoples' interests, the Iranian Students Association is sponsoring a conference on Tuesday, Nov. 8, 1977 at 7:30 p.m. in the EMU.

We invite everyone to participate in this conference and help us to organize central demonstrations against Shah's U.S. visit in San Francisco and Washington D.C.

Kaveh Ahangar
Iranian Students Assoc.

Letters policy

The Emerald will accept and try to print all letters and opinion columns containing fair comment on ideas and topics of concern or interest to the University community. Letters and opinions will be run on a first-come, first-served basis. Both letters and opinions must be typewritten, using 65 character margins, and should be triple-spaced.

Tuesday, November 8, 1977