

Human tragedy

Last week's television presentation, "The Holocaust," raised many feelings, questions and concerns. Thursday night, there was to be a discussion organized by the Campus Christian Ministry and the Jewish Student Union to share some of the sorrow and fear, to unite and reaffirm the basic nature of humankind as good.

It was terribly unfortunate that a small group of people would have seized this moment to air their

political message. This descent upon an unwitting audience was a most inappropriate display of what I believe to be the basis of the Arab-Israeli conflict: a mutual anti-semitism.

The feelings raised by "The Holocaust" are not political. "The Holocaust" was not only a Jewish tragedy, but a human tragedy of unequalled magnitude. An Arab and a Jew should be able to feel this together. Until we do I see little hope for real peace.

Howard Greenwald
Junior, Biology

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 opinion columns must be typewritten, using 65 character margins, and should be triple-spaced. Letters and opinions must be signed and the author's field of study (or faculty status) noted.

Bookstore profits

Submitted by Mark Cogan, Bookstore Board of directors member, senior political science

The University of Oregon Bookstore is supposed to be operated on a non-profit basis. In my two years on the Bookstore's Board of Directors I have grown increasingly dissatisfied with the fact that in recent history the Bookstore has been displaying a consistent record of high profits — a record that is hardly becoming to a 'non-profit' organization.

Let's look at the Bookstore's financial records. In the past three years, the Bookstore has made an astounding total of \$320,000 in profits. In the current fiscal year, the Bookstore has already made profits of over \$100,000. Of the \$320,000 made over the last three years, \$103,000 has gone into increased cash, with another \$173,000 going into increased inventories. Are such profits appropriate for an organization that is supposed to be "non profit"? I think not.

Some profits are reasonable if they are needed to assure financial solvency for the Bookstore. On this account, the Bookstore is already on solid ground, with \$200,000 in bonds and an anticipated stable University enrollment for the future. No additional profits are needed to assure financial solvency.

A second reasonable justification for some profits is to maintain an inventory that must be expanded due to inflation on such items as books and school supplies. This inflation allowance for inventory maintenance calls for about \$45,000 annual profits.

Why, then, is the Bookstore amassing profits so much in excess of amounts needed to maintain its operations? The problem lies with a Board of Directors that, as a whole, is too sympathetic to salting away money for possible future expansion that is now no more than a gleam in some people's eyes. The Board is not as sympathetic as it should be to the difficulties borne by students who have to suffer repeated tuition increases and high textbook prices.

At its last meeting, the Board decided to reduce this year's profits by the token amount of from \$10,000 to \$15,000. At the same time, however, the Board decided to shift funds into accounts to help finance vague notions of possible future expansion and to partially pay for cash registers that won't even be purchased until three years from now. Rather than operate on a modest, pay-as-you-go basis, the present Board of Directors prefers to operate the Bookstore in a fashion as to chalk up huge profits and then frantically scramble for a place to hide them.

I should mention that even Bookstore Manager Jim Williams went into the April Board meeting proposing that this year's profits be cut to a much smaller figure than that decided upon by the Board. The blame for this policy direction must fall squarely on the shoulders of the Board of Directors — not Bookstore management.

I should also mention that the Emerald, with its apparent disinterest in covering Board meetings, has permitted the Bookstore's excessive profits to remain safely unknown to the public. Since my term of office on the Board will soon be ending, this is my last real opportunity to bring these facts to public attention.

The problem of excessive profits is a matter of Bookstore policy to be addressed by the Board of Directors. Rectifying the situation is a simple as electing Board members who take the consumer-oriented approach of reducing Bookstore profits.

Happily, there are at least three such persons running for election to positions on the Bookstore Board of Directors. They are Janet Eggleston, Dave Tyler and Rocky Schatz. In the election this week, please do yourself a favor and vote for these candidates and a Bookstore that is more accountable to its membership.

Scrutinize the candidates

Submitted by Roger Senders Senior, Speech/Education and 12 co-signers

Having just completed a budgetary hearing with the Incidental Fee Committee, we felt you, the student body, would be interested in the approach taken by the IFC members to represent your interest in the allocation of incidental fees. In this letter we offer observations of the way the IFC seems to be dealing with ASUO programs in general. We offer specific examples from the hearing on the Forensics budget, but apparently the behavior was not unique. It should also be noted that not all IFC members behave in the manner noted below, only a majority of them.

The criteria by which IFC members determine the budgets of programs is arbitrary and capricious. Although each program must submit a list of program goals through which funding levels are to be set, these goals are ignored. For example, during the hearing for Forensics, the Committee discussed a motion to fund intercollegiate competition at \$6,200. One committee member informed the audience that the procedure was to be handled, "like an auction." The auction ended when intercollegiate competition was "sold" for \$5,000. In justifying this figure, the committee member who made the motion remarked that the figure he had arrived at was, "arbitrary." An audience member asked if the more proper term might be, "capricious." A second committee member responded, "Well, they're the same thing aren't they?" The IFC should be neither.

Any committee which allocates funds, evaluated programs and votes on important matters must operate efficiently. Committee members have an obligation to conduct themselves reasonably during a hearing. A majority of the IFC members demonstrated a severe lack of knowledge of parliamentary procedures. At times, members of the committee admitted they were confused on which motion was on the floor, which motions were open to discussion and whether a vote was in order. Throughout the hearing, members spoke without being recognized, to offer such pertinent comments as (in discussing fundraising), "Well, I have 18 boxes of Girl Scout cookies at home, I'll let you have." These far from

cogent comments waste the valuable time of all parties involved.

In addition to an apparent lack of understanding of how to operate a hearing, many of the committee members conducted themselves in a rude and irresponsible manner. It would seem as though some of the IFC members were more interested in "playing power games" than in representing the student body in the allocation of incidental fees. Continually throughout the meeting, one of your representatives attempted to monopolize discussion whether from her seat or from the other parts of the room to which she aimlessly wandered. Another member exhibited little willingness to discuss motions as he was intent upon zero budgeting the program.

By the end of the hearing, the committee realized that the Forensics Program had been cut by more than the 10 percent allowable under IFC guidelines. To make up for the cut, one committee member offered a motion to increase funding for "payroll assessment" from \$35.76 to over \$500. The motion was supported by at least two members until discussion pointed out the absurdity and irresponsibility of the motion. You see, payroll assessment can't be spent on any Forensics projects. The motion was an attempt to meet the guidelines and still keep the money from being available to Forensics. We congratulate the majority of the committee for being aware of their responsibility to the student body and the organizations that serve it, by voting down the motion.

The experience has been an awakening one for us. We have seen what can happen when a student body shows little interest in the selection process for its representatives. We have seen an appallingly rude panel of "representatives" behave in a wholly irresponsible and arbitrary fashion. This must stop! Certain members are an embarrassment to the student body and the University as a whole. In the future, we urge you, the Associated Students of the University of Oregon, to get qualified candidates to run. We urge you to carefully scrutinize candidates who do run and then get out and vote. Only the student body can stop this embarrassment from happening again!

