

Vote today — or hold your peace

ASUO president: Wilkins best choice

More than ever, the ASUO needs a president who will be a strong, effective advocate of student rights and issues.

Even though the need is great, only four men — no women — are running.

Tom Brannon, a self-proclaimed "average student," is right when he says student government is dominated by campus politicians, and would benefit from fresh ideas. Unfortunately Brannon has none.

Donovan Guy and Bruce Mills have relatively little ASUO experience to boast of, so they have campaigned on an anti-Rich Wilkins platform.

Wilkins, the fourth candidate, is supported by the same law school/Greek coalition that has been putting ASUO and IFC candidates into office — including this year's atrocious IFC — for the past few elections.

The biggest difference between the candidates is proven experience. Wilkins has done a good job as ASUO vice president for state and university affairs, and his experience with the Legislature will prove invaluable. Any ground that he's made with the Legislature will be lost if another candidate is elected.

Wilkins probably would model his administration after that of current ASUO Pres. Dave Eaton. Eaton has managed the executive office effectively, and Wilkins is his natural successor.

With the law school and the Greeks endorsing Wilkins, his victory seems likely.

We, too, endorse Wilkins. His fairness and knowledge of the ASUO and the University make him best qualified to respond to the concerns voiced by students.

No dearth of good IFC candidates

Next year's Incidental Fee Committee is going to be one helluva lot better than this year's committee.

This year's committee was at times rude, unprepared, irresponsible and arbitrary. At no time did the committee show the maturity necessary of a group that handles \$2.5 million.

Luckily, plenty of competent candidates have entered the field to ensure improvement on next year's committee.

Kathleen "Katcha" Phinney, an intelligent and energetic sophomore, is concerned with the welfare of student programs. She wants more cooperation between the ASUO and IFC, and would make a fine committee member.

Xavier Romano would bring a unique perspective to the committee along with his dedication and desire. Romano, a Latin Jew who is in the

year. His experience on the EMU Board has given him suitable budgetary experience.

David Gibson has also done his homework on ASUO programs. He's concerned with addressing the needs of the programs and not being rude. This year's committee didn't take the time to do their jobs right, he says.

Ken Packman has been on the wrong side of the IFC this year — as a member of the Food-Op. He's seen what a dishonest and adversarial committee can do, and would add social conscience to the committee.

Law student Steve Baldwin has worked for OSPIRG, and echoes Packman's disregard for this year's committee. Baldwin, who has a master's degree in philosophy, wants to instill some accountability to the committee.

Pam Jordan and Cathi Balone would make adequate committee members, but neither are as enthusiastic as the top seven candidates. Jordan filed for the post, withdrew, then withdrew her withdrawal. Balone, a law student, doesn't seem to be familiar with the committee.

The other two candidates, Jonathan Bernstein and John Miche, both have ideas about the issues, but neither knows enough about the IFC or the ASUO programs.

We urge you to vote for Phinney, Romano, Contreras, Rasmussen, Gibson, Packman and Baldwin.

Gus Palmitessa, the running mate of presidential candidate Rich Wilkins, has apparently lined up an entire Greek/law school "ticket." It looks like nothing more than an endorsement of their seven favored candidates.

Regardless of who's "on" the ticket, it's important to judge the candidates individually.

ours

Chi Psi fraternity, has done his homework on all ASUO programs, not just the Third World programs he's been involved with.

Alan Contreras served on the committee in 1979-80, and would give next year's group added experience. Unfortunately, Contreras enjoys the political games that have helped ruin the IFC this year. Still, his track record is excellent.

Second-year law student Karsten Rasmussen isn't familiar with individual ASUO programs, but is determined to make IFC hearings forthright. Rasmussen correctly states that programs "got the shaft" because the IFC was not candid this

yours

Join marchers

A month before his March 1980 assassination, El Salvador's Archbishop Oscar Romero asked that the U.S. government prohibit military aid to his country. He asked also that our government not intervene with military, economic or diplomatic pressure. Intervention by the U.S. government, the archbishop said, would "undoubtedly aggravate the repression and injustice against the organized people who have been struggling for their fundamental human rights." News reports tell us Romero was right.

The April 18th Coalition is outraged by U.S. government's intervention in El Salvador — that's why we are taking to Eugene's streets on Saturday, April 21. We want to publicly demonstrate our resistance to policies which cut programs for poor and working people at home and divert resources to repressive governments abroad.

We're asking people to join us in Saturday's march, which departs from 13th and Kincaid at noon. A 1 p.m. rally at the 11th and Willamette parking lot will feature speakers Ricardo Melara, of El Salvador; Congressman Jim Weaver; Susan Morales, American Indian Movement; Sue Gordon, Oregon Church Women United; Gene Bailey, International Longshoremen Workers' Union, and Marion Malcolm, Clergy and Laity Concerned. We are planning an evening cultural event and potluck at the Emerald Baptist Church.

The April 18th Coalition is a broad-based organization of more than 90 local groups and individuals. We have banded together to oppose U.S. intervention in

El Salvador, and to support the right of the Salvadoran people to self-determination. Please join us on Saturday.

**Keli Osborn
and co-signers**

Courts unjust

The recent "Martin vs Rostker" decision concerning draft registration goes to show our courts will trample on the Constitution, if doing so will further the interests of Federal power even at the expense of the civil rights of U.S. citizens.

"Liberty Lobby," a grass-roots conservative organization, opposes the draft and forced registration. They brought the suit to court challenging the constitutionality of ex-President Carter's registration plan which forces 18-20 year olds to register for any future draft. The organization contends the current law violates the Due Process clause of the Fifth Amendment by singling out only a particular segment of our population who happen to be a certain age.

Strangely enough, U.S. District judge Thomas A. Flannery actually sided with those against the law, but only in principle. Unfortunately, he upheld current registration guidelines declaring them in government's "legitimate governmental interest." So much for the Constitution. It seems in the government's interests to ignore it.

Allowing government the power to exercise ownership over certain citizens of a particular age is a dangerous precedent to establish if you cherish living in a free country. What will the future be like if Americans sit back and allow their Constitutional rights to continue eroding away in favor of

"governmental interests"? Aggressive foreign nations may pose a danger but the greatest current threat to democracy is a strong, centralized government. Madison and Jefferson realized this 200 years ago — lets not forget it now.

**Michael Cross
Junior, political science**

Emotionally blinded

James D. Miller's editorial (4-8, "Love It or Leave It) is a good example of what happens when you write an editorial in an emotional frame of mind without any regard to the logic of what you are saying.

In the initial paragraph he implies that anyone that opposes forced military conscription is a "commie sissy." Obviously he also feels this is an accurate description of President Reagan's administration which has taken a position against forced military service.

Miller goes on to say that those who evaded the totalitarian-like practice of coerced servitude in the military service by skipping to Canada were "cowards" and "had no right to return," even after they were pardoned by Mr. Ford for their so-called "crime." These citizens did not desert because of fear but, rather, because they were courageous enough to stand behind their own convictions and refused to participate in a war for which they saw no cause.

Mr. Miller then further shows how his emotions have successfully blinded his power to reason by making the glaring generalization that these draft evaders "are the same people who stand and watch someone beaten to death and are

too afraid to stop it."

Miller's call for getting 100 percent behind the government and his chastisement of Isenberg for making his complaints public is typical of the American who puts blind faith in his or her sometimes inept leaders, and who fails to understand the nature of a democracy and the active role that dissent has in continually bettering the country in which we all happen to live.

Looking at the thrust of Mr. Miller's statement, perhaps he should make a career out of serving his country; he seems to be one of the few, the proud, and the ignorant that the Marines are looking for.

**Steve Thompson
2060 Alder Street**

letters policy

The Emerald will accept and attempt to print all letters containing fair comment on issues, ideas and topics of interest to the University community. Letters must be limited to 250 words.

Each letter must be signed and the author's field of study or faculty or staff status noted. Each should be dated, and must also include the address and phone number of the author for verification prior to publication.

The Emerald reserves the right to edit any letter for length, style or content. Publication of letters is dependent upon available space and can not be guaranteed.