

Qualities sought in IFC candidates

At times this year, the Incidental Fee Committee has looked more like an adult version of *Romper Room* than an elected panel doling out millions of dollars in student fees.

Petty insider squabbling, immature stomping out of hearings and a lackadaisical approach to the budget process has stagnated the IFC at a time when University students can least afford it. Because of Measure 5 money crunches, the 1991-92 IFC needed to be one of leadership. It has not been.

Obviously, it is time for a change. As could be expected, many students have filed for the IFC — 19 to be exact, for six seats. With this year's problems in mind, the *Emerald* set out to look for candidates who would put aside past political leanings and get on to the business of responsibly allocating student monies. The endorsement panel was looking for:

- Professionalism and a hard-work ethic. Candidates who expressed a desire to spend the time needed to make honest and fair decisions were preferred.
- Specific and clear ideas for changing the status quo of the IFC.
- Some experience in either budgeting or leading a student group.
- An expressed purpose of working as part of a team.
- Actual attendance of an IFC hearing. It is surprising how few of the candidates had been to even one.

These were the main points the board was looking for. Those endorsed, in most cases, simply stated their plans more clearly than did other candidates.

Here are the *Emerald* IFC endorsements for the April 22 ASUO primary elections.

Starting with the two-year seats (two are open), **Steve Masat** was by far the most qualified candidate in the field. Masat, who is the current budget analyst for the IFC, has the most experience and the best ideas for turning the IFC into a smoother-running organization. His plan to prioritize budgets (spending more time on the bigger requests) is plain common sense, yet none of the other two-year candidates expressed the same idea.

For the second seat, **Steve Suarez** gets the nod. A law student, Suarez's idea of having a "presumption against funding" has merit. As an IFC member, Suarez said he would expect groups to do more fund raising before coming in front of the IFC. In a time of diminishing funds, Suarez's idea makes fiscal sense.

In the IFC one-year seat race (with four openings), four candidates stood out more than the others.

First, **Efram Mehretab** has experience and an understanding of what the IFC does. He has a long history of group involvement at the University, and gave concrete examples of what he would do as an IFC member. Mehretab's plan for scrutinizing the athletic department's budget, and possibly charging a user fee for tickets, is both innovative and unique.

Like Mehretab, **Barbara Rodgers** also has budget and leadership experience. Rodgers is co-director of Saferide and expressed a need for getting more students working at the EMU — thus paring back the budget (by canceling and combining some salaries) and increasing student involvement.

Ed Carson has seen the IFC from a different perspective. Carson, as a reporter for the *Oregon Commentator*, wrote about the IFC this year, and came into his endorsement hearing with an insightful understanding of how the committee works, and specific examples of how it could be improved. He emphasized fund raising to take some of the burden off IFC funding, and like Masat, realized the importance of prioritizing groups.

Finally, **Chris Bauman** rounds out the *Emerald* slate. Bauman has an impressive background of involvement on numerous University committees, and would bring an exuberance and desire to work hard to the IFC. Her idea to cut funding to groups which duplicate other organizations' contributions is one that, so far, has been mostly unexplored.

All of the IFC candidates demonstrated merit and experience, but with this many candidates running, the *Emerald* editorial board picked those who stood out from the crowd.

Best of luck to all the candidates.



"BELIEVE ME, BORIS... I SYMPATHIZE TOTALLY WITH YOU. I'M SURE THAT IF I COULD THINK OF ANY MEANINGFUL REFORMS, OUR CONGRESS WOULD OPPOSE ME, TOO!"

COMMENTARY

Ads offensive despite disclaimer

By Star Holmberg

As I am neither a Beanery patron nor a victim of homophobia, I cannot claim firsthand expertise in the *Lavender Network's* coffee-house controversy (*ODE*, April 2). However, I have been perusing the *Lavender Network* publication for a long time, and reading about the recent Beanery saga in the *Emerald* as well as the *Lavender Network* has inspired me to share some of my observations and thoughts.

Yes indeed, those phone sex advertisements — or as I prefer to call them, dial-a-hunk ads — are no doubt a primary bone of contention for some heterosexual customers and perhaps even for some homosexual folks. It's hard to imagine that there aren't any liberated lesbians in our PC valley who don't cringe at the reversal of exploitation the lewd ads embody.

A couple of years ago, it boggled my mind to think supposedly liberated women could associate themselves with a magazine that prints such advertisements, but then it dawned on me what a good source of revenue such ads must be, and my wonderment dissipated.

Besides, up until the March issue (at least in recent months), those ads were bunched in the "all male pull-out section," and that might have afforded some the women some sense of separation from the questionable product being marketed. Last time I looked, the ads had been moved from the center of *Lavender Network* to the back pages. Perhaps further distancing?

In any case, I still am perplexed by *Lavender Network*

The ads and some written portions are trash and detract considerably from the otherwise good, quality copy Lavender Network produces.

publisher Ronald Zahn's comment that they don't publish "pornography or erotica at all." OK, so it ain't *Penthouse*, and the few suggestive pictures are usually of men who either are depicted as saying naughty things or who have their genitals strategically covered.

And most casual heterosexual readers might not have read the fine print when Big Sister gave advice on how to maintain one's restraining devices for sadomasochistic pleasure-seeking (December '91) or when she addressed the matter of vibrator use for sexual pleasure (March '92).

I realize that in this day and age such examples may be regarded by many as only moderately offensive. Personally, I can relate to a more traditional interpretation of such a phenomenon: The ads and some written portions are trash and detract considerably from the otherwise good, quality copy *Lavender Network* produces.

I am not suggesting a city-wide censorship of the stuff, but I can relate to objections in some establishments and facilities. For instance, I was appalled to find it accessible in

the periodical section of the Eugene Public Library. In fact, I filed a Request for Reconsideration of Library Materials with the senior librarian last fall.

When all was said and done and I received an official response from City Librarian Carl Hildebrand, my concerns were clearly alien to the committee and staff involved in the Reconsideration Request. The response was polite, but the bottom line was that regardless of how tasteless some portions of the publication admittedly are, its overall value to the community supersedes the issue of decency. Though what the ads promote (note call-in lines for those "over 18") could be legally obscene, the ads themselves are supposedly not.

Not being a practitioner of doublespeak, I was flabbergasted. It will be interesting to see what the up and coming disclaimer about "potentially offensive content" (*ODE*, April 2) will amount to. Will it only be for *Lavender Network* at the Beanery, or will it be included with all distributed copies?

I have to agree with Zahn on one count, though our views on ad obscenity vary widely. The disclaimer does sound "pretty silly." A disclaimer may afford some legal protection for parties involved in making the publication accessible to the public, and it may serve as a token apology to people who object. However, the source of the debate will remain as it was — offensive to many.

What kind of accord is that? Sounds lopsided to me.

Star Holmberg is a Eugene resident and mother of two.

COMMENTARY POLICY

The *Oregon Daily Emerald* welcomes commentaries from the public concerning topics of interest to the University community.

Commentaries should be between 750 and 1,000 words, legible and signed, and the identification of the writer must be verified upon submission. The *Emerald* reserves the right to edit for grammar, style and length if necessary.

CORRECTION

In an article in Friday's *Emerald*, the wrong date was given for the International Night celebration. The event takes place Sunday, April 26.

The *Emerald* regrets the error and any confusion it may have caused.