

IFC candidates show promise

This year's problems with the Incidental Fee Committee have been well documented. Resignations, miscommunication and a general breakdown in the board's operation have contributed to an IFC panel that, at times, didn't seem to be doing its job.

No one will dispute the importance of IFC. After all, the committee handles almost \$4.5 million of student funds. It is one of only a handful of similar university boards around the country that is entirely student-run, student-elected and student-controlled. The need for consistent policy and committed members is considerable.

That, more than anything, determined our endorsements for IFC elections this Thursday and Friday. This year's IFC has been hit hard by the lack of stability. Students right now pay almost \$300 a year in incidental fees, and yet there are problems with the more than 80 student group budgets around campus. The IFC needs leaders, both old and new.

First, the one-year seats. **Ernie Brown**, current Black Student Union president, will make a fine addition to the IFC board. He was very impressive with his knowledge of the committee's responsibility. His plan to make the IFC "financially accountable" is sound, and he seems committed to hard work.

Jennifer Bills is another worthy of IFC membership. Her experience is hard to fault as she put together budgets for both the Gay and Lesbian Alliance and United States Student Association. In addition, Bills would bring several new ideas to the IFC. She has expertise in fund-raising, and knows ways for student groups to get alternative money.

JoSonja Watson promises to bring "a different viewpoint" to the board. As it's been noted that there are no women currently on the IFC, Watson and Bills would automatically bring a different viewpoint if elected, but we do admire Watson's focus on student empowerment. Watson doesn't have as much accounting experience as we'd like, but she impressed us with her determination to learn IFC operations and becoming a contributing member.

Barclay Lloyd Grayson, treasurer of Interfraternity Council, earns our last one-year nod. A self-described "numbers man," Grayson has experience handling budgets, and could serve as a resident expert on money matters. Grayson pledged to hold "information sessions" to teach groups how to create a budget — a commendable idea.

Another one-year candidate deserves mention. Ed Henderson has extensive budgeting and accounting experience, but unfortunately, is new to the campus. Because he doesn't know a great deal about the IFC's duties, we couldn't endorse him for a seat. However, we urge him to take his talents to other student agencies. He would make a fine ASUO comptroller or finance coordinator. Someone with his experience should not go to waste.

Deciding our two-year nominations was difficult because we saw three qualified people for two available slots. The three are **Don Stull**, **Tim Hughes** and **Freddy Vilches**.

Stull gets our unqualified nod. After this year, some new blood is needed on this panel and he has it. While he doesn't have any IFC experience, Stull does possess an accounting background and substantial knowledge of the incidental fee process. He brings energy for the job, which has been lacking from this year's board. He's also a student-parent, and non-traditional students need a voice on the board.

Deciding between Hughes and Vilches was hard. In addition to new blood, we also see a need for experience and guidance in the way IFC works. Both Hughes and Vilches would bring to the board that experience, as each has served a previous term on IFC and served it well.

In the end, we lean toward Hughes. He's a proven campus leader with previous IFC experience. He will instill confidence in IFC decisions, and keep the other members motivated. Hughes would add the greater diversity and independence to the board.

All in all, the next edition of the IFC has a promising cast. While it is impossible to predict how the election will turn out, voters won't go wrong if they consider the above candidates.



Letters

Big picture

Rob Jefferson and associates (*ODE*, April 12) are really "sick" of those who would like to see some ancient forests left for our future generations to experience; apparently we don't "see the big picture."

The "big" picture, hum. Now let me see if I have this right, friends. Your broad-minded view is that it is OK to cut down large areas of trees which have been on Earth for many centuries, so that the logger can earn a living today, in this instant of Earth-time? And who cares if we eliminate another animal from the planet; less competition, right?

And so what if trees produce oxygen and help stabilize the soil. I need to make money. That is the painting of the "big picture?" It seems to me that instead of looking through a microscope and seeing only the logger or the mill worker, you step back, way back, and look at the Earth. Yes, the Big Picture.

We must work together to ensure that future generations inherit a clean environment, filled with lots of animals, and yes, lots of ancient forests.

John Chambers
Eugene

Choices

I am writing in response to the April 5 article regarding Students for Choice and the pro-choice movement on this campus. While I appreciate the generally unbiased tone of the article, I feel as if some of my views were misrepresented.

I wish to clarify that Students for Choice opposes any restrictions of a woman's right to choose. We therefore are strongly against and will fight to deflect the anti-choice initiatives slated for the November ballot, as well as any future anti-choice legislation introduced in this state.

The article stated that I had referred to the University as a "pro-abortion" campus. This is an incorrect misrepresentation of my views and the views of the organization that I represent. Students for Choice be-

lieves that this campus has a pro-choice majority. While many pro-choice individuals would not consider abortion as a personal option, they wish to preserve the right of all women to choose safe, legal and accessible abortion.

Choice is not an issue of women's rights; it is an issue of human rights, and we all must work to maintain control over our own bodies.

Sara Stankey
Students for Choice

AD abuses

Last year, the University Athletic Department received \$1.829 million in students' incidental fees. After the failure of the Sports Action Lottery to produce any sizable revenue, it will likely ask you for significantly more money in the future.

Because of the enormous impact athletics carries, many abuses are overlooked or hidden from our view. Take, for example, the fact that the women's volleyball team could not secure homecourt advantage for their NCAA appearance due to lack of funds, yet there was enough money to claim a bowl bid for the football squad.

The inability of the Incidental Fee Committee, or students in general, to monitor and regulate athletic department decisions is clear.

The question becomes: Should students have more control over funding athletics past signing the checks over to the Athletic Department? Do students deserve to be more involved because it is our money that they are asking for? Do students deserve to be treated more like partners or push-overs?

I believe it would be wise to involve students more. ASUO Vice President Scott Wyckoff has proposed a model "Student-Athletic Department Board." This idea comes from a similar structure at the University of Kansas.

It is not just an advisory board — it has specific duties to approve or revise the AD budget. This type of board

would be able to bring accountability to the athletic department. I fully support this measure to gain student input and control over student funds.

Michael Colson
IFC candidate

Compassion

Once again a pro-vivisectionist, Pamela Daener (*ODE*, April 11) was unable to respond to the issue of research animal pain and suffering. Once again animals have been pitted against humans. And once again compassion was deemed as only applying to humans.

I am an animal rights activist, and for me, as with all the animal rights activists I know, animal rights is simply an extension of my compassion for humans. It has never been a question of either compassion for humans or compassion for animals. I am as concerned about homelessness, racism, sexism and oppressive governments as I am about animals, but I have chosen to help animals at this time because I feel most productive doing so.

You may not believe this, but I am also concerned about those humans who suffer from disease; both mental and physical. Their suffering and deaths are extremely tragic. However, I am unable to ignore my compassion for other species because some members of my species suffer. To me, it seems inconceivable to assume that we can do whatever we want to something just because it looks and acts differently than we do.

Pro-vivisectionists seem to feel that looking and acting differently invalidates suffering, but I cannot believe this. To me, it is wrong to cause pain and suffering to one animal, even if the hoped-for result is to alleviate pain and suffering of others.

But perhaps this is too complex for people who see compassion as humans or animals, rather than feeling compassion for all things that live.

Kathy Yonker
Political science