

Revise Our Constitution

We Do Not Really Need Three ASUO Presidents, 100 Senators

Last May 18 the Oregon Daily Emerald pointed out several flaws in our current constitution. The ASUO Senate has finally begun working on it. ASUO Vice President Art Erickson is not sure whether or not it will be completed in time to be on the Spring ballot, however.

We urge that the Senate take all possible action to revise our ridiculous and antiquated constitution as soon as possible. Student leaders have wailed about its inadequacies for years. We would hate to see another ASUO Senate burdened by its existence.

The writer of the original document were very careful to prescribe what requirements officeholders should meet to hold office. One of these is that an officeholder should be a student, but included as an ex-officio non-elective officer is the Director of Student Affairs—a non-student.

Another minor but potentially hazardous oversight is the failure to establish a term of office for officeholders. This means that new officers can be elected in accordance with the provisions of the rest of the Constitution, but that the old ones never go out of office until they become ineligible, usually by leaving school. Legally then, we have three student body presidents (Dan Williams, Neil Goldschmidt, and Walt Grebe) and over a hundred Senate members.

But this is not all. According to the Constitution, the ASUO President (or all three of them in our case) has powers as outlined in nine separate clauses. Five of these deal with his appointment powers, one an ex-officio position, two his presiding and coordinating functions, one his responsibility to submit a budget to the Senate each term (which is not done now), and one clause making him responsible for carrying out the legislation enacted by the Senate. He has no other power. This means that every action of the ASUO President in which he represents the University Students or takes action in their behalf may be illegal unless previously approved by the Senate.

The Constitution establishes the Cabinet as an administrative arm of the President. Yet its function is an advisory one. No administrative action is taken by it. In fact it would be very difficult for the Emerald Editor, Co-op Board Chairman, or the IFC President to administer parts of the ASUO.

Article V of the Constitution establishes a Student Court. No one has been appointed to it for a number of years, and its functions are handled by the Student Faculty Disciplinary Committee. The court provision should be abolished.

In the section governing Elections, there is a great mass of poorly organized material which tells the exact times and dates of filing, balloting, and contesting. Much of this material should be in the by-laws, not in the constitution, since circumstances will change so that new rulings would be more efficient. In fact, the constitution is inconsistent on this point. It states all the regulations for the general election in the body of the constitution, and all the rules for the primary in the by-laws. Confusing indeed.

And, concerning the by-laws, they are not authorized as being legal in the constitution. Therefore all the by-laws under which the Senate operates are invalid to begin with.

There is much more, including the under-representation on the senate of under-class dormitory students and fraternity and sorority members.

We would also think that the Senate should consider many additions, such as the possibility of the ASUO Vice President presiding over the Senate, and giving the president a veto power.

Revision of a constitution is a long process. The Senate should have started it much earlier in the year, but now is no time to worry about that. An adequate constitution is necessary for an adequate student government, no matter when it takes effect.

All three student body presidents and all 100 senators should get to work on it right away.



"MORE VIGAH, PLEASE."

Phil Cogswell

How An Educator Views Higher Education's Future

What will higher education be like in the year 2000?

One possible answer to this question was discussed recently by Alvin Eurich, director of the Fund for the Advancement of Education, in an address given at the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges.

Eurich predicts that whole new teaching techniques must and will be found to accommodate the tremendous increases in the number of persons seeking higher education.

"If we were to continue operating our colleges along conventional lines, we would need to construct more college facilities in the next 15 years than we have built in all our history," Eurich pointed out.

"WE OBVIOUSLY cannot accommodate such numbers within the conventional framework of our educational system. We are virtually forced to consider how we can use available resources more effectively and efficiently."

He adds that all our plans must be made with the awareness that the world of the 21st century will be a quite different place than it is now.

He said, "The changes of the next 40 years, we are told, will equal the significance those of the last 400." The changes which are certainly coming "will affect higher education profoundly," he stated, "We must be prepared to meet them intelligently."

Eurich, in his speech, then considered how these challenges might be met. He did this by use of the "looking backward" technique—pretending to be in the year 2000 and looking backward to see what the changes have been.

IN LOOKING backward, Eurich sees an extensive junior college system, with a junior college "available for every young man and woman within commuting distance from home." In addition, teachers colleges have completely disappeared and their place has been taken by large multipurpose institutions which, along with the strong liberal arts colleges and universities, have discontinued the first two years, since these now come within the province of the junior college.

"The transition took place with surprising smoothness," Eurich states. "Once football, basketball, and other sports became completely professionalized, and the social fraternities and sororities vanished from the scene, the need for the first two years of college abruptly

ceased."

OTHER CHANGES in higher education which Eurich, predicts include:

- Giant universities some enrolling more than 200,000 students.

- Strengthening of the content of education on all levels in two ways: (1) clearer definition of the objectives of education, and (2) production of "new curricula" due to growing alarm by scholars over our "soft education."

- Development of new learning processes, which make the best teaching available to all students and adaption of instruction to individual rates of learning. Eurich predicts that the use of educational TV, individual learning techniques, and other advances will make the standard lecture obsolete.

"Together, these techniques enabled us to break through the ancient framework which used to bind college education into a rigid pattern. No longer do we have to divide the day into fixed fifty-minute periods, no longer do we measure a student's progress by the number of credit hours he has 'banked,' no longer do we march all students along through the same series of lectures and classes."

Eurich concluded his speech by pointing out that his was only one man's view. "Each of

(Continued on page 3)

Letters to the Editor

100 Rude Students

Emerald Editor:

There is one lecture class here at this university that is composed of about 100 rude students who need spanking. If this sort of behavior is typical of all U. of O. students I blush to be here. But I don't believe it is typical.

No mature group would carry on a continual buzz of chatter throughout 50 minutes of instruction on difficult material. No mature group would slam books shut, put on coats, and walk out of a classroom five minutes before the bell at a "pause" in the lecture. No mature group would do this to any teacher, and to do it week in and week out to a man with a doctor's degree is a disgrace. This could hardly be typical conduct for people who are so mature they don't need rules! We are crying about dormitory and university rules when we don't even know the rules of common decency.

Margaret Brown
Sophomore in Pre-Nursing

Protection

Emerald Editor:

I live in a dormitory. That is because my parents think I am a Big Girl Old Enough to Take Care of Herself. But a group on this campus doesn't think so. I don't exactly know who this

group it—but I guess I'm not expected to, as long as I follow its dictates.

It is protecting me from the big, bad world—from vice, unfemininity, and filth.

First, it protects me against apartments. But what about cars? More male-type university students have cars than have apartments.

Second, the group protects me from appearing unladylike. Thus I wear my slinky sexy skirt in 20 degree weather rather than my toasty-warm wool slacks. Being A Lady is much more important than getting pneumonia.

Finally, it protects me against dirt and germs. My room is checked for neatness every week. But why do I get only one clean sheet in the same period of time? In keeping with the logic behind many dorm policies, I'd rather have my room checked every two weeks if I could get a complete change of bedding every week.

And why aren't women working in the cafeteria lines required to cover their hair? Perhaps, along with all the other rules we are fed, they are expected to keep their curls squeaky clean? This is what I tell myself whenever I find a lovely black strand on my hash.

What a joke on Mommy and Daddy! They thought I was old enough to protect myself. Dear, dear old U of O protectors, who

will take care of me after I graduate?

But I mustn't question. For this is a legislative year.

Alene Sharff
Freshman, Journalism

Protests Proposal

If lawyers could devise a way to re-charter University of Oregon as a private institution—and thereby free it from the grasp of your state legislature—the school, with its excellent faculty and location, could grow to the stature of a Berkeley or Chicago.

Its only other hope (besides federalization of all state universities) would be for the voters of Oregon to eliminate scores of provincial legislators at the polls. Rep. Stafford Hansell's (R-Hermiston) proposal to "limit non-Oregon students" to "10%" of enrollment (Feb. 11 EMERALD) and thereby supposedly save the state money is typical of the attempts by legislators to intimidate the university and reduce it to a overblown junior college.

If Hansell's proposal is adopted (and it might as well be modified to read "no non-Oregon students" the school will reel under a series of contingent losses. To just skim a few: enrichment that foreign and out-state students bring to any state school, resultant monolithic stu-

(Continued on page 3)

OREGON DAILY EMERALD
The Oregon Daily Emerald is published seven 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 opinions of the ASUO or the University.

RON BUEL, Editor
MARTY KETELS, Business Manager
TED MAHAR, Managing Editor
EVERETTE DENNIS, News Editor
PHIL COGSWELL, Editorial Page Editor
LARRY WILLIAMS, Advertising Manager
JOHN BUCHNER, Sports Editor
DULCY MORAN, Assistant Managing Editor
DAVE SANDS, JIM FRAKE, JANET GOETZE, Assistant News Editors
GEORGE BIGHAM, Photo Editor
LINDA BROWN, Entertainment Editor
RON COWAN, CATHY NEVILLE, THORA WILLIAMS, Associate News Editors
DICK RICHARDSON, Feature Editor
EDITORIAL BOARD:
Ron Buel, Phil Cogswell, Ted Mahar, Everett Dennis, Dave Sands, Dulcy Moran, Linda Brown, Bob Forsyth, Hal Snow, Grant Ledgerwood, Doug Ragen, Janet Goetze, and Bill Hutchison