

Revised Constitution Causes Protests

Four Coeds: New Revision

Dear Miss Montag:
In your editorials concerning the revised ASUO constitution you have appealed to the students to consider carefully this reform of their student government and have asked for suggestions for improving the present form of government on the campus.

We believe that the students who have really read the constitution as compared to the old one are not satisfied with the present revision. The revision is as full of holes as a hot air register; in fact, it somewhat resembles a sieve. Under all the legalistic language is the obvious fact that this new government gives the students no more hold on their own affairs than before. The congress is merely a set-up whereby the students can quibble over minor points; there is a very neat little clause giving control over any issue which the faculty deems important enough for long-haired consideration to the president of the University.

By this method the administration still holds us in the palms of their venerable work-worn and calloused hands. We don't want to fight the administration because we do after all want to stay in school, but we believe that the student should insist on gaining control of their own government. Otherwise the ASUO government is only a ruse; the faculty bigwigs are still the bosses and the ASUO officers are only their wardheelers.

We suspect that those clauses were included in the constitution at the suggestion of the bosses.

We believe that it is your duty as Emerald editor to let the administration know of the attitudes of the students on this vital matter. We believe that the Emerald, as spokesman for the students and our only champion, should editorially oppose the present revision of the constitution, and insist that a new constitution eliminating administration coercion should be written by the committee.

Hoping that you will regard this

BOB CALKINS: Re-Draft Constitution

Dear Editor:
It would seem that the labor and time expended on the framing of a new ASUO constitution would resolve itself into definite benefits for the students. In reference to this, the designers of the constitution of the student congress have failed in one vital respect.

The objectives of the new constitution are commendable, but, it is evident that something, or someone, stood between these objectives and their fulfillment.

Manage Own Affairs?

Mr. Craig states that one of the objectives of the new constitution is to give the students an opportunity to manage their own affairs. At wide variance with this policy is the headline on the Emerald story: "New Student Government Plans Comply With Administration Requests." The administration requests that: "The president of the University of Oregon shall be responsible for and shall administer all extra-curricular activities." (Article II, Section II).

It is understood that the president is responsible for all departments of the University, and this fact, adequately stated in higher authorities than the ASUO constitution, need not be repeated.

Student Administration

As to the administration of extra-curricular activities of the Associated Students, this should be left entirely to the students, if the objectives of the committee are to be realized.

I believe that the constitution as proposed is not in the best interests of student government, and that it should be re-drafted on the premise that the duty of the administration is to advise, not dominate, the Associated Students.

Sincerely,
Bob Calkins

letter as concrete evidence of the students' concern with their government and the welfare of the campus, we remain,

Sincerely yours,
Maryellen Wright
Roberta Scott
Helen McFetridge
Kathleen King

Fred Samain: No Referendum

The letters printed on this page were selected from 26 received by the Emerald yesterday. They are representative of the feelings expressed in the other letters, which were signed by individual students, and which cannot be printed in this issue because of lack of space.

Dear Miss Montag:

I am taking this opportunity to express my opinions regarding the proposed constitution for the Associated Students of the University of Oregon in both of its forms as have appeared in your publication.

In my opinion the previous form was much to be preferred to the latter form. I think it was much superior in both context and organization. In the last text much of the material that rightfully belongs to the constitution has been transferred to the by-laws, changes to which, apparently, have not been provided for.

In fact, I see no need or logical reason for by-laws. It is my confirmed belief that the only secondary law we should have in this organization are those created by the legislative group itself.

Little Voice

I felt that the greatest weakness in the original proposal was the lack of student voice in the whole organization, due primarily to the lack of control over the elective officers and legislators in the original plans. Where were those primary guardians of the rights of the populace, initiative, referendum and recall. I could not find them in the text.

I had supposed that the purpose of student government was to enable its constituents to gain first-hand knowledge and experience in self government. Apparently I was wrong, for in spite of the fact that many of the students are eligible to cast their ballots on local and national issues, this revised constitution places the entire membership under the paternal thumb of a rank outsider.

Advice and Counsel

Article II, Section II, reads, "The president of the University of Oregon shall be responsible for and administer all extra-curricular activities." If that portion in print does not remove all chance of self-government I do not know how it may be done. In this point I do not mean to be impertinent. I fully realize that youth is tempestuous and eager to try its wings. I highly value sound counsel and advice. Nevertheless I feel that this advice should be considered only as advice and sage counsel.

There are many other points upon which I failed to concur with the constitution committee. I wish that I could ask them to justify their stands on such questions as: preferential voting, lack of expressed class standing for elections, absence of public voice in appointment of the judiciary committee, clarification of standing committees.

No Alterations

In my opinion this new constitution is merely a reiteration of the old constitution without one major alteration. As a device to delude the uninquiring mind, it establishes a student congress to replace the executive council. Perhaps it will add to the general confusion about student affairs, but little more.

I plead that if we are going to have a new constitution, let us have one that will put the student government and "all extra-curricu-

BYRON MAYO: Clause Nullifies Purpose

To the Editor:
The drafting committee of the new ASUO constitution has done a good job! On the surface, this document is a model form for an active student government. However, in the recently proposed additions to the constitution there is a clause which is going to nullify the whole idea of University students finally taking an active interest in managing their own affairs.

According to the committee, "Students have been criticized for a seeming lack of ability to manage their own affairs and activities, while in reality the present governmental form gives them no opportunity to do so. If, by the time the student reaches college age, he is given no chance to prove his competence in the practice of democratic processes, he will be of doubtful political use to his community, state, or nation when he leaves school. Development of the ability to assume an active part of college education as the regular curricular subjects."

This has been proven true and the original idea of drafting a new ASUO constitution was to make it possible for University men and women to actually control their own activities. Then—what do we find?

In Article II, Section II of the purported constitution, the president of the University of Oregon is given the authority to administer all extra-curricular activities. In other words, it is written in our proposed student constitution that the president of the University is empowered to nullify any action under this association.

In reality, the University president has actual control over student affairs, anyway. Why add such a written section to a document that is supposed to be a model for self-government? Isn't it about time that the University of Oregon student-body had an ASUO constitution that proposed a student government only—even if it is to be in name only?

Byron W. Mayo

To the Editor:
It is rumored that the student congress committee, although definitely in favor of an all-student congress, because of pressure brought to bear on them, has been forced to allow the faculty to play the major role. If this is the situation, why the camouflage?

Jim Ellison

lar activities" where they rightfully belong, into the hands of the students of the University of Oregon.

Respectfully,
Fred Samain

Four Students: Citizenship Training

What is this thing called student government? We are inclined to think that it indoctrinates the principle of government by the students and for the students. We cannot be too greatly criticized for this belief and yet we are not allowed the opportunity to fulfill our ideal. We think that it is finally being granted to us yet from present evidence our hopes become rapidly snatched from our hands.

Is it that the administration fears that the students will gain too much power? Primarily, a state university, or any college, exists for the students and should offer unlimited opportunities to gain practical experience in the problems that will face us in the years to come. Let us take a second look at Article II, Section II, a revision in the proposed ASUO constitution as requested by the administration.

Are we to be tied to "mother's apron strings" and then cut loose abruptly and thrown into the "Hard Cruel World" or can't we be a thinking and acting group, gaining essential knowledge and given the chance to apply it?

Betty Carlson
Marge Cowlin
Barbara Pearson
Ann Winkler

GIL ROBERTS

My dear Miss Montag,
I do not know what the general feeling around the campus is in regard to the new constitution, but I for one feel that it is too much like the old one.

It still assumes that the president of the University is a presiding officer of the ASUO, and leaves altogether too much authority in his hands. It is not in tune with the stated objects. I cannot feel that the duty of the student body is to assist the officials of the administration, but rather vice versa.

I feel that the students of the committee did not break free from the traditions of the old constitution.

Yours truly,
Gil Roberts.

ADVERTISING STAFF

Day Manager:
D. L. Persinger
Layout:
Earl "Bing" Croghan
Kit Wilhelm
Solicitors:
Earl "Bing" Croghan
Virginia Parr
Mary Jean Reeves
Office Staff:
Beryl Howard, Office Mgr.
Arlene O'Rourke

Student Demonstration...

A single section of the proposed new ASUO constitution has drawn the fire of a number of Oregon students in letters to the Emerald. The controversy centers on this paragraph which appears in the present student body constitution but which was omitted from the first draft of the revised constitution:

"The president of the University of Oregon shall be responsible for and shall administer all extra-curricular activities."

The vagueness and all-inclusive wording of this paragraph makes it an obvious target for student criticism. It leaves the impression that no freedom of action is given the student government and that no decisions can be made by an ASUO president, council, or congress, without the express approval of the president of the University.

The other main point of contention is found in Article VI, Section I, of the amendments. It states that the control of "all affairs and interests of the Associated Students of the University of Oregon, except those delegated by the president of the University to other sources, shall be vested solely in the University congress . . ."

This paragraph seems meaningless when no outline of the powers delegated by the University president to other sources is included.

The writers of the letters have a reasonable basis for their statements. What is needed now is a more clear-cut definition of exactly what they desire in the way of revision. The aroused students must make their constructive criticisms more evident.

Twenty-six letters, some of them signed by from four to 80 students, have been received. The interest in student government and more participation in student affairs is proved in the letters. Together, and with other students, they must work out a plan for action.

OREGON Daily EMERALD

LOUISE MONTAG Editor	ANNAMAE WINSHIP Business Manager
MARGUERITE WITTEWER Managing Editor	BILL SETSER Advertising Manager
JEANNE SIMMONDS News Editor	
MARILYN SAGE, WINIFRED ROMTVEDT Associate Editors	
Leonard Turnbull, Fred Beckwith Co-Sports Editors	TED BUSH Chief Night Editor
MARYAN HOWARD Assistant Managing Editor	ANITA YOUNG Women's Page Editor
MARYANN THIELEN Assistant News Editor	JACK CRAIG World News Editor
BERNARD ENGEL Chief Copy Editor	BETTY BENNETT CRAMER Music Editor
Editorial Board Mary Margaret Ellsworth, Jack Craig, Ed Allen, Beverly Ayer	

Published daily during the college year except Sundays, Mondays, and holidays and final exam periods by the Associated Students, University of Oregon. Entered as second-class matter at the postoffice, Eugene, Oregon.