

## The Parking Situation

In that amorphous world of "who is responsible for what" the student parking situation seems to be a principal character. The student pays his money for parking privileges, which more often than not don't seem to exist. If the student has a complaint about the situation, there seems to be little recourse but to suffer with it.

At the present time the student has two avenues for recommendations. He can take his suggestions to the ASUO Parking Committee or to the Student-Faculty Traffic Court. These two avenues will lead to frustration, as the student will soon discover.

The ASUO Parking Committee is about as inert a committee as you will find on this or any other campus. It, at present, is not allowed to send a representative to the Campus Planning Committee, which, it seems, is the untouchable center of parking activities. A letter of recommendation can be sent by the ASUO committee to the Planning Committee, but the course it must travel seems to be littered with many circular files.

The second recourse for recommendations is the Student-Faculty Traffic Court. Like the ASUO organization it must use the impersonal letter for contact, although Assistant Dean of Men Bruce Brenn, the advisor, said that the Campus Planning Committee has smiled kindly upon Traffic Court recommendations.

The ASUO Senate, aware of the above problems, posed four questions at the last Senate meeting.

1. Do students have an effectual say in the policies of the Planning Committee concerning parking?

2. Should faculty and staff pay for parking stickers as do students?
3. What is the possibility of a joint faculty-student committee to make the parking policy?
4. Problem of publicity—couldn't parking rules and regulations be among the packets received during registration?

To the first question the answer is a definitive NO, as was explained above. The only possible solution to this problem is found in the answer to number three. While the possibility of student representation to the Planning Committee is not yet known, there is no doubt that there should be student representation.

A letter is an impotent method of presenting your ideas or complaints. Only through student representation can an effective move be made to solve a problem that is just as much the affairs of the students as the affairs of the faculty, if not more so.

Most faculty members consider free parking a "fringe benefit," and for this reason it is unlikely that they will be required to buy stickers as the students do.

Question four was posed as a solution to the great number of student violations. Yes, it is a good idea to include the parking rules in the registration packet, but better yet, wouldn't it be wise to re-examine the present facilities and perhaps adapt them more to the existing problem?

Whatever the solution may be to the parking situation, it is hoped that the ASUO letter to the Campus Planning Committee concerning the four problems will not falter and fall into one of those circular files.

## Suspicion Confirmed



"MASTERFULLY WRITTEN PROFESSOR SNARF—IT'S SELDOM MY PLEASURE TO SEE A TEST WITH SO MANY AMBIGUOUS QUESTIONS."

## Guest Column

### 'Politeness' at Oregon Varies; It Can Even Replace Learning

(Editor's Note: Stanley R. Maveety has been a member of the University's English Department since 1955. He teaches classes in both English composition and literature, and his educational background includes undergraduate work at Northwestern and graduate study at Columbia and Stanford, where he received his Ph.D. in 1956. After three years of contact with Oregon's students, Mr. Maveety has some definite—and interesting—impressions of them.)

By Stanley R. Maveety

Three years ago, after a very short exposure to Oregon students, I answered a question from an older faculty member with the observation that Oregon students seemed quite polite. I believed it then and meant it as a favorable comment; I still believe it, but I don't mean it now as an unqualified compliment.

When I think of the politeness of Oregon students—something that really sets them off a bit from others I've encountered—I think first of some slightly baffled comp. student leaving the office after a wrestle with the complexity of dangling verbals, or an earnest but confused attempt to see just what it is that's wrong with the passive voice.

At the door he turns and says wearily, but as if he meant it, "Thanks." He says it as if the struggle had taken a bit of my time and energy too. Now this is good, partly for the simple reason that it happens to be true. And this much of the Duck spirit of politeness I wouldn't change.

But I can think of another side. Let me conjure up the image of a sweet young thing who answers some comment of mine with, "Oh yes! I certainly think that Shakespeare has a lot to offer." I agree, but I'm bothered by the sneaky suspicion that although she's edging toward the door, it's not for a quick dash to the library.

Now I don't mean that she's an apple-polisher; we've all met him (and her). An apple polisher is trying to confuse the teacher, and he's not confused himself. But this young lady

(let me have my way about this for the sake of the point) was not being hypocritical; she was herself a bit confused. Just at that moment, and for the dear sweat sake of Oregonian politeness, she really half-believed that she did favor the good old Bard.

She recovered, I'm sure, as soon as she got out into the fresh air, but she's likely to have a relapse if she falls into conversation with anyone from the English Department. Under the anesthetic spell of good manners she may even imagine for the moment that she's become fond of Chaucer!

This young lady Duck couldn't possibly have said, "I really don't like what we've been reading in Lit." That would have jarred the poor old teacher; but (and this is my point) I believe that it would have been worth being rude (on these terms) in order to have been talking honest good sense.

It might even have led to an honest discussion of what, in her opinion and in mine, was good and what was bad about a certain assignment or series of assignments. Who knows (a shocking thought), the instructor might even have learned something from the student.

I recall being jarred once, by a very different sort of student, who obviously was not typically polite; he told me straight that he studied part of the quarter's work thoroughly because he liked it and that after a small taste he ignored another part. He even went on with this heresy of honesty to say that he was aware that his attitude would not be good for his grade.

Don't misunderstand me. I wouldn't hold him up as a perfect model any more than I'd turn the classroom into a scene of argument for the sake of argument. I'm convinced that what he tasted and left alone was worth his trouble. But there was something in his attitude worth noticing, for its novelty if nothing else: he seemed to have the idea that it was his course, in fact his education, simply because he was paying for it—a rather curious way of looking at it, don't you think?

## Mike Forrester

### Play the Congressional 'Name Game': Try Picking Liberals, Conservatives

The terms "liberal" and "conservative" have always been thrown around in American politics pretty impressionistically. When a senator espouses more pay for postal workers, he is tagged "liberal." If a senator votes against a high dam at Hell's Canyon, he is a "conservative." When a senator like the late Walter George votes for foreign aid but against more government spending, persons are confused, and so the man becomes a "moderate."

In this latter category have landed Sens. John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson, former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, President Eisenhower, and Vice-President Nixon. These persons and many more are thought to be inconsistent in their political behavior, and they are a little bothersome since one can't fit them neatly into the liberal or conservative slots.

Today a liberal is a person who doesn't bat an eye at government spending and in general is one who fearlessly upholds the inherent rights of the "common man." He is intensely in sympathy with all underdeveloped peoples and is the arch foe of nuclear testing.

The conservative is for indi-

vidual initiative and consequently believes that big labor is bad, that the government shouldn't meddle in the states' affairs, and that socialism is around the corner. And it follows that those "foreign fellows" should look out for themselves.

The curious thing about the "name game" is that the moderates have generally been more successful politicians than either the liberals or the conservatives, and the most influential politicians have been moderates.

The moderate is one who, unlike the whole-hog liberal or conservative, doesn't particularly care to follow a set political philosophy and realizes that if he did, he would no longer be successful. He instead lives his political life more "by ear" than by heart. William S. White, political columnist, in his book about the U.S. Senate, *Citadel*, writes of the good senator:

"... One cannot forever refuse there to make any compromise at all and remain a good, or effective, member... This is no place for the man who has ONLY principle; for every genuine political fanatic is simply awash with principle as he understands the term." Other qualities he mentions are: "A concentration upon the coherent and important and an avoidance of the diffuse and doubtful. A deep skill in sensing what may and may not be done."

This advice holds true for more than just U.S. Senators. The political idealist, the leader of movements is only occasionally successful and although he may become a famous man,

he never rises very high in real influence.

A moderate defies neat description because he has what

(Continued on page 3)

## Letter to the Editor

**Emerald Editor:**

Aside from the fact that we lost the game last Saturday, there was much else to make the day a miserable one.

The first was the fact that there were so many students of the University who had to sit in third rate seats out in the rain, while the "general admission" people sat in the cover of the grandstands. We were of the impression that the University of Oregon opposed the kind of "big business" in athletics that goes on in the Southern California schools. This impression has been changed. It seems that Oregon too now has more regard for the dollar than for the student when it comes to athletic events. Maybe this is one of the pitfalls of a winning team. Because there is no way to waive athletic event charges in the tuition price, the athletic department feels that we do not have to be treated like "paying guests." For the hundreds of students who had to sit in a cold rain while the "paying crowd" sat in comfort, the University should be truly ashamed.

Second, we are appalled by the tactics and the manners dis-

(Continued on page 3)

## OREGON DAILY EMERALD

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published four times in September and five days a week during the school year, except during examination and vacation periods, by the Student Publications Board of the University of Oregon. Entered as second class matter at the post office, Eugene, Oregon. Subscription rates: \$5 per year, \$2 per term.

Opinions expressed on the editorial page are those of The Emerald and do not pretend to represent the opinion of the ASUO or the University.

PHIL HAGER, Editor  
BILL BRYANT, Business Manager