

Board wants student to pay for its mistake

For a branch of the ASUO to come under fire twice in less than a week is not all that unusual. But when that branch is active for less than two weeks of the entire year, you've got to start wondering.

Of course, we're talking about the ASUO Elections Board, which is responsible for running the yearly ASUO elections.

In the primary election, first-year law student Oscar Garcia received enough write-in votes for Student Senate seat No. 17 to qualify for the general election — and the elections board error machine kicked into full gear.

Garcia should have been elated at his primary success. And he probably would have been had the elections board bothered to notify him. Garcia first learned of his advancement to the general election in the April 29 *Emerald*.

A similar problem arose in the ASUO Executive race as well, when Leslie Warren and Mark Johnson's only information concerning the fate of their campaign came from the *Emerald*.

It is the obligation and duty of the elections board, not the *Emerald*, to promptly notify candidates of the results of their campaigns.

Garcia said he was notified after the general election that, even though he received the most votes, he would not be seated. Confused (and rightly so), Garcia asked, "Why?" Because, he was told, he did not officially file for the seat.

According to ASUO election rules, a candidate who receives enough votes in a primary election to be placed on the general election ballot, must first officially file for the office being sought.

Of course, because no one officially notified Garcia of his success in the primary, and because no one informed him of his obligation to file for the office, he did not.

The rules are quite clear in this matter. A candidate who does not file cannot be placed on the general election ballot. In fact, the rules are so clear, the elections board placed Garcia on the ballot anyway.

Garcia went on to receive 64 votes and win the election. But now the elections board has decided that, because of its mistake, Garcia cannot be declared the winner. Garcia's only mistake was assuming the elections board knew what it was doing.

Garcia said he was told the board couldn't contact him during the days leading up to the general election. Yet, the day after, it had no problem getting in touch with him.

Garcia's phone number, as listed in the student directory, is not correct because he has moved. However, every law student has a personal mailbox at the law school. The board, had it actually made an effort, would have figured this out and left a note in his box. Or it could have left a note with the law school secretary. Or it could have done whatever it did to learn Garcia's phone number, but in one or two days, instead of eight.

Garcia is filing a complaint with the Constitution Court, asking to be seated. And because the board effectively waived the filing requirement by placing Garcia on the ballot, he should be given the seat to which he was duly elected.



LETTERS

Empowerment

After reading the letter in the *Emerald* about being "Glad to leave" (*ODE*, March 8), I realized I am also glad to go. The outcome of 1990's Ballot Measure 5 is unfortunate to say the least; but we should do a little soul-searching to find out if some of our money is being spent in ways not only foolish, but also contrary to the values of our democracy.

As someone who has held a variety of jobs to pay tuition, I am angered that no student input is allowed on the purchase of periodicals for the Knight Library. I find *Playboy* demeaning to women. I don't think I am alone in my view.

In addition, the University Bookstore's pornographic selections add more degradation and violence to a society already steeped in both.

Worse yet is the fact that every college student at the University funds the library's subscription.

I wrote letters to the administrators of both the Knight Library and the bookstore. However, as experienced by many minority students, my voice also was not heard. How many others have felt powerless when dealing with the administration? How about getting power out of the hands of a few and into the hands of many? After all, it's our university.

Kaye Rauch
Science

Final word

I was disappointed by the April 13 diatribe from Kurt Landre in response to my recent comments in these pages about "cognitive compartmentalization" (*ODE*, April 12 and 15).

Basically, my contention boils down to this: Principles of clear thinking should be applied uniformly to both non-religious and religious knowledge (and truth) claims.

Minimally, there are three

tests of validation that any proposition (or belief) that is to be considered credible must meet: First, is there verified evidence in support of the assertion in question? Second, does the assertion involve logical internal consistency? Third, is the assertion compatible with previously validated knowledge claims?

On the basis of these evaluative criteria, the Christian religious doctrine of a "virgin birth" (for example) fails the tests of credible plausibility — and people who employ their intellectual faculties consistently and critically will express genuine skepticism about any such proposition. Not to do so gives rise to what I have described as cognitive compartmentalization.

In short, those propositions that are not backed up by evidence and credible validation procedures do not constitute confirmed knowledge, but merely unsubstantiated belief. Accordingly, to pledge one's full allegiance to various religious doctrines of dubious credibility, while also affirming the need for tests of validation to evaluate non-religious knowledge claims, is to manifest inconsistent cognitive compartmentalization.

Contrary to Landre's opinion, one does not have to be a "specialist" in theology or philosophy to understand the logic of this analysis. The use of one's critical intelligence is the only requirement.

I rest my case.

Ron Rousseve
Professor
Counseling Psychology

100 days fair

The editorial "Clinton's 100 days unfair measurement" (*ODE*, April 26) doesn't interpret the 100-day assessment adequately.

The reason columnists are criticizing Clinton's first 100 days is because these days have

been disappointing. True, FDR's 100 days were a great success in part because of the Depression. But Clinton's platform in the campaign was that America was in a similar (albeit less severe) crisis, and he was the man for change.

The first 100 days are what many call the "honeymoon period," the time when the country is excited and hopeful about the new president, and when the president generally has the broadest support and is most likely to introduce successful legislation. So far, Clinton has been somewhat less than successful (to say the least) when it comes to legislation.

I am a supporter of Clinton and I do believe he has noble intentions, but as the 100 days wind down and support for him becomes less enthusiastic, my optimism fades into a realization that we may be in for another four years of deadlock. I hope I am wrong.

Steve Johnson
Finance
Political Science

Sorry

I have decided to write one more time, but this time to dispute myself.

I wrote a letter (*ODE*, April 30) in response to Eric Eckhart's letter (*ODE*, April 27), and now I want to comment on my own letter.

Reading back over the letter, I realize how short and cut off it was; for that I am sorry.

Eric wrote a beautiful letter; he was clear and to the point. Although my views on homosexuality are different than his, I feel it wasn't my place to dispute him.

God really got me for that one. I guess that's what I get for letting my human nature get the best of me again. Once again, I am sorry.

Kristen Kessler
Psychology

Oregon Daily Emerald

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published daily Monday through Friday during the school year and Tuesday and Thursday during the summer by the Oregon Daily Emerald Publishing Co. Inc., at the University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

The Emerald operates independently of the University with offices at Suite 300 of the Erb Memorial Union and is a member of the Associated Press.

The Emerald is private property. The unlawful removal or use of papers is prosecutable by law.

Editor: Pat Malach			
News Editor	Jake Berg	Sports Editor	Dave Charbonneau
Editorial Editor	Martin Fisher	Editorial Editor	Rivers Janssen
Graphics Editor	Jeff Paslay	Supplements Editor	Calley Anderson
Entertainment Editor	Freya Horn	Night Editor	Jake Berg

Associate Editors: Tammy Batey, Student Government/Activities; Daralyn Trappe, Community; Colleen Pohlig, Higher Education/Administration

News Staff: Chester Allen, Matt Bender, Justin Brown, Sarah Clark, Meg Dedolph, Amy Devenport, Jen Ellison, Amanda Fernie, Anthony Forney, Beth Hege, Teresa Huntsinger, Lisa Mauri, Rebecca Merritt, Steve Mims, Katy Moeller, Tiffini Mueller, Trista Noel, Ellen Shaw, Erick Studenicka, Marion Sultor, Randy Thieben, Michele Thompson-Aguilar, Amy Van Tuyl, Todd Williams, Clayton Yee

General Manager: Judy Riedl Production Manager: Michele Ross

Advertising: Tom Leech Sales Manager, Shawn Berven, Office Manager, Jane Irola, Teresa Isabelle, Philip Johnson II, Chris Kanoff, Jeremy Mason, Van V. O'Bryan II, Gillian Oh, Rachael Trull, Angie Windheim

Classified: Becky Merchant, Manager, Barry Logan, Sharon Sauve

Distribution: Brandon Anderson, Nick Manning, Graham Simpson

Business: Kathy Carbone, Supervisor, Judy Connolly

Production: Ingrid White, Production Coordinator, Kristine Granger, Dee McCobb, Stacy Mitchell, Jennifer Roland, Jennifer Smith

Newsroom	346-5511	Display Advertising	346-3712
Business Office	346-5512	Classified Advertising	346-4343