

Needed: Mutual Understanding

Apathy is dead. The members of the student body are more than ever interested in campus issues.

Those of us who have been familiar with the workings of student government in the last year realize the tremendous progress that has been made. A year ago students did not care to express concern about ROTC, frosh orientation, department curricula, advisor-advisee relations, dorm food, athletic policy, tuition, women's rules, election systems, academic responsibility, etc.

Apathy is dead, but in its place has come a somewhat overzealous attempt by some to get easy and fast answers to big problems.

In the last school year we have made real progress toward making the University of Oregon a much better university. World Affairs Week, the new election system, and the new ASUO Publicity Committee are a few examples of this progress. However the progress that was made occurred only because the administration, the faculty, and the students worked together with a feeling of common purpose.

The new election system for instance was a result of cooperation from a faculty member in the law school, a member of the office of Student Affairs' staff, Senate members, and interested students. There are many

other instances of this cooperation that resulted in similar progress.

However with the new student interest there could develop a problem that might well stifle progress for all. That problem is a possible lack of communication and understanding between the students, the faculty and the administration.

This paper is on a sort of middle ground. We can see and feel the strong student body desire for action on one side and the administrative details that require time and try patience on the other.

It is our desire that all parties understand the situation. The administration and the faculty should recognize and welcome the new interest of the students and realize that this will mean that new action must be taken in answering old problems. The students should use wisely their new interest and the responsibility that is coming with it. They should realize that the mechanics of government do not lend themselves to overnight change. Big problems seldom have simple answers.

If the students, the faculty and the administration understand each other and work together to solve the aforementioned problems as they did the problems of the past year, solutions are sure to follow.

Conferences

Various campus organizations, including both living-groups and activity honoraries, are in the habit of staging, or at least taking part in, annual conferences or retreats during the school year.

These conferences and get-togethers are quite numerous—in fact, too long to list with any justification; and the great quantity existing brings forth a question. Are they really worthwhile?

Of course, it's hard to generalize about a thing like this because of the varied interests and goals the meetings represent, but one thing is sure—some of them are lacking in value and merely waste the time and money of everyone concerned.

This statement can be backed up merely by asking someone who belongs to a campus honorary if he thinks the national convention or district retreat is a necessary part of the whole group's operation. Chances are the answer will be an indifferent shrug or at best, in most cases, a half-hearted attempt to justify the existence of the meeting.

Again, it must be emphasized that a few of these meetings do serve a very worthwhile purpose and are necessary to the successful operation of the entire organization—national fraternity and sorority conventions could certainly be included in this category.

But how about the UO chapter of Sigma Rho Phi, national mending honorary? What is the necessity of sending two or three delegates to a district conference in Seattle

for the annual rules and principles meeting when the group does nothing on its own campus but exist in name only for those few who happen to share an interest in it.

Granted the above example is hypothetical, but the fact remains that it does have a parallel or two, or three, or more that hit pretty close to home.

Opinions have been expressed by several students who are members of campus honoraries and organizations both pro and con on this subject, and a very limited cross-section seems to indicate that the conferences are looked upon as a general waste of time and something that could better be left out.

However, these people are quick to point out that in some cases, merely getting together with other students and discussing common subjects validates the entire meeting, no matter how worthless it might be otherwise.

In the final analysis, of course, the worth of student conferences and annual retreats and the like must be determined by the individual student who attends them. Still, the fact that many, many dollars are spent on arranging and encouraging the continuance of these meetings warrants a close re-evaluation of whether they actually serve the purposes they were intended.

Think it over the next time your particular organization slates a convention with like beings on another campus in another part of the country.

And ask yourself is it worth the time and effort?



Senior Anticipation

Looking Ahead—number 2

AWS President Asks Help on Rules Revision

By DIANA SCOTT

One of the well-worn phrases on this campus reads to the effect that the Associated Women Students are organized because women have problems which need special consideration. The truth of this cliché is shown in the now prevalent dissatisfaction with women's rules.

No longer is there anyone among faculty, administration, and student leaders who denies that a problem exists. Even those who have in the past played the role of the proverbial ostrich—heads hidden securely in the sand—are willing to face the problem.

In the past perhaps even those most concerned and those who were working to improve the situation were a little like the ostrich. It is too easy for leaders of AWS to make small revisions of unimportant rules each year. Dissatisfaction is thus kept to a minimum, but the problem remains, ready to flare up anew at any moment.

Perhaps there has been a tendency within AWS to become too busy in the Ivory Tower to understand the conditions under which women students must live and study.

This spring the new AWS legislature has resolved to pursue a course of action which is designed to straighten out some of the major difficulties with rules. First, rules governing women at the University of Oregon are created in at least four different places. In the past AWS has handled only a part of these rules, and has assumed that the others must be intrinsically good. The inconsistencies and contradictions in rules stemming from different sources have already been exposed. The AWS rules committee will, for the first time, assemble all the rules affecting women at one time. Being a person who tries to obey rules whenever possible, I personally resent a system of rules which by its very nature prohibits obedience.

Secondly, there are too many rules. Many should be completely eliminated; others must be simplified and clarified. The hearings planned by the AWS legislature for next week will provide an opportunity for every woman student on the campus to contribute to the new code which should develop this spring.

Group living demands some uniformities in behavior. As these uniformities are made most effective by writing them down and calling them rules, I do not advocate abolishing all rules. However, to me it seems that the fewer rules there are, the more effective and better followed they will be.

The AWS Legislature is doing its part to remedy the rule situation. Now it is up to every woman student who has a gripe to do her part. Two weeks ago a letter writer to the Emerald stated that AWS was not really interested in the views of the women on the campus. Being anxious to hear all constructive criticisms and suggested improvements, I made an appointment to talk to her. I am still waiting for her to keep the appointment.

It is time for everyone on the campus, the average student as well as those in positions of responsibility, to work constructively. There has been plenty of talk, plenty of generalized gripes! We need action. We need lists of specific rules with solid reasoning to support their elimination or change! Living organization presidents have been asked to discuss rules in house or dorm meetings. Specific suggestions will be sincerely welcomed by those who have the task of evaluating present rules. Only with the support and cooperation of its members can the Associated Women Students accomplish its goal of solving women's problems on the campus.

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.
DON JEPSEN, Editor
WARREN RUCKER, Business Manager
PEPPER ALLEN, Managing Editor
JEFF WILLIAMS, News Editor
JOHN R. GUSTAFSON, Editorial Page Editor
SUE CLARK, Advertising Manager
KAREN MAUNEY, ELLIOT CARSON, Associate Editors
DICK MCKINNEY, RANNY GREEN, Sports Editors
MARY JO STEWART, Women's News Editor
LARRY KURTZ, Assistant News Editor
EVERETT CUTLER, Entertainment Editor
JOHN RUSSELL, Photo Editor

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Emerald Editor:

An editorial in last Thursday's Emerald pointed to an annual loss of \$40,000 by the athletic department. This deficit is made up by a head tax on each student of \$13.50 per year. The editor suggests that perhaps the individuals so taxed should be represented in decisions on how to spend the money.

He questions the choice of "minor" sports to be supported.

A more important question that should be raised is whether inter-collegiate competitive sports of any kind should be

supported by the students. The real students on this campus derive no benefit from any of these activities anyway—they are too busy with more adult concerns. The people who really benefit—the businessmen of Eugene, the athletes who are paid for their participation, and the athletic department itself—should be left to their own devices to keep the operation out of the red. If any taxes are to be paid it should be paid by the athletic department to the University! Foundation grants to campus scientists are taxed by the Uni-

versity. Why shouldn't donations to the athletic department also be taxed.

If the \$13.50 assessment on students is to continue, a better proposal would be to spend the \$77,000 now given to the athletic department on scholarships—for real scholars instead of for football players. Certainly the editor is quite right, taxation without representation is as abhorrent to University students today as it was to our colonial forefathers. Press on the issue! However, do not un-

(Continued on page 3)