

A Lesson In Montana

The Far Right, Higher Education and Academic Freedom

There has been a lot of soul-searching among Oregon educators since the legislative tax program was defeated on October 15. Some observers of the state's political scene believe the election results are indicative of a growing ultra-conservative, anti-government climate. This atmosphere would not be conducive to an expanding higher education system or academic freedom. Some prominent political leaders are "running scared" believing that the new austerity mood of the electorate may have its toll on individual legislators next year. At present there is fiscal hysteria among state administrators and uncertainty regarding the citizen's motives in turning down the tax bill paired with the active participation of elements of the frantic right in the successful no-vote campaign leaves many open avenues for the extreme right. Oregon could be on the verge of the course taken by several other western states that have become Birch-riden in recent years. The implications for higher education in a situation such as this are frightening to say the least.

The chaotic state of higher education in Montana is a vivid example of the direct relationship between academic mediocrity and the "avoid controversy" policy prompted by right wing strength within the state. Time and a number of other publications have recently probed the crumbling Montana situation focusing on the resignation of Montana State University President Harry K. Newburn. Newburn is a former president of the University of Oregon. Writing in *Frontier*, the western opinion journal, in September Laverne Hamilton describes the influence of Newburn's avoid controversy attitude on the faculty of the university. The Newburn administration, Hamilton

writes, "used its control over salaries, promotion, hiring and firing to punish those of whom it approved and to reward those who helped build its idea of a proper public image of the University." Hamilton says "black marks" were assigned to professors for "negative public service." On one occasion an assistant professor who publicly opposed private fallout shelters received almost no raises for three years although "his teaching and research were admittedly outstanding."

Another case involved the firing of an associate professor with seven years service to the University rather than give him tenure. "This brilliant teacher and exceptional scholar had threatened the precious image by such activities as a one-man parade on U.N. Day, after Montana's far-right Governor Tim Babcock refused to proclaim it." The writer said 1962 was the year of the great exodus of faculty members due to lack of academic freedom. He maintains that the Newburn policy was prompted by the ultra-conservative mood of the state. The result of the Newburn policy as summarized by a report of the Advisory Committee to the Dean of the MSU College of Arts and Sciences was a "deteriorating academic climate."

Some University of Oregon alumni have misgivings about Oregon's "image" in the state and wonder about the relationship of Gus Hall, big time athletics and other controversy. If these alumni are really concerned about the University fulfilling its role as a seeker of truth and knowledge, we hope they learn by the mess in Montana. A university cannot afford to have its values shift with the political climate of a state.

Janet and the Sportswriters

Since the turn of the century the story of the fight of women for equal rights has been one of a struggle against almost overwhelming odds, entrenched, unbending opposition and against that almost insuperable barrier—tradition.

Yes, success has crowned the struggle for the vote, for equal rights, for later closing hours—but one struggle remains.

That is the lone struggle of a charming young lady who has the unlikely position of sports news editor for the Emerald.

Our Heroine, Janet O'Dell, merely wants to be able to cover Saturday's Oregon-San Jose game—the Berry Bowl—from the

Hayward Field press box.

But, just as Pauline Pureheart faced the black-hearted villains—and wound up on the railroad tracks—Janet has suffered only rebuffs.

Tradition says "No women in the press box." Seemingly it would be possible for the Dean of Oregon Sportswriters and cohorts to move over one space and allow the Emerald's Janet a place in that citadel of cliché-ridden copy about Silver-haired Web-foot mentor Cas and his fleet Oregon Ducks.

Let her in, please fellas. How about it Dick, George, L.H.? and especially good ol' Hal and Art and Leo?

Letters To the Editor

Supports New Code

Emerald Editor:

We, the residents of Collier Hall have followed with extreme and understandable interest the emergence of the new Student Conduct Code.

We reject the idea that absolute control of student discipline by dormitory administration will prove any better than it has in the past.

We firmly believe that the student court system is workable and desirable. Trial by ones peers has always been a basic process in American democracy.

We feel strongly that the new system will be far more effective than the old in helping all of us become rational, responsible and mature individuals.

**Michael G. Foster,
President
Collier Hall**

Editor's Note: This letter was also signed by 50 other residents of Collier Hall. Their names are on file in the editor's office.

Misquoted

Emerald Editor:

In his report of a YMCA Dialogue, which appeared in the Wednesday Emerald, Steve Green states that I "charged that football dominates the entire athletics program at the University." While a look at the budget of the Athletics Department might support this, it was not what I said. I made no "charges" regarding this University's program but merely pointed out that, in any university and emphasis upon football is a logical consequence of giving priority to the public relations value of an athletics program.

**Robert Campbell,
Department of
Economics**

Questions for Co-op

Emerald Editor:

This is a list of questions to be considered by all members of the Co-op:

In the first place, why is it said that the Side building has to be destroyed, and who insists on this?

Why should a building that has been providing over \$9,000 per year in rents, be considered an unwise financial holding?

Why has a student vote of 3 to 1 in favor of saving the Side been ignored by members of the Co-op board?

Why has a petition in favor of saving the Side, signed by over 2700 students, likewise been ignored by the Co-op board?

Why is our architectural heritage considered expendable when the majority of student opinion is in favor of preservation?

How much more money would be made by tearing down the Side and erecting a new Co-op building on that site?

Is it the purpose of the Co-op

to make more money?

The students are not concerned that the Co-op profit more—they show it by their votes to save the Side. Who is it that wishes the Co-op to make more money?

If a new building must be built, why cannot this new building be built elsewhere? Why not more centrally located—nearer the dormitories, for example?

Is it true that an alternate site on University property is feared because then the Co-op organization might come under University control?

And if it did, how is this considered not advantageous, and to what interests would that be harmful? The service to the students would not be less.

Why is it insisted, and who insists, that the Co-op building be on private property? Of what advantage is this to the students?

Why does the whole movement to destroy the Side building seem to be motivated by economic interests when the economic stability of the Co-op is assured as it is right now?

Why is there so much interest that the Co-op should sell more goods, and profit more?

Or is it the thought of expanded services to the Co-op members that is the motivating factor in the move to destroy the Side?

But the members are the Co-op! Expanded services or no, they wish the Side building saved. Why are the votes and petitions of the students ignored?

Are the student's wishes truly considered of no account in this matter?

Who considers the Co-op members so ignorant of the values involved here that the Side building must be destroyed "for their own good"?

Will it be necessary to call a special meeting of the members of the Co-op (the first in history) to save the Side building?

**Vic Sabin
1895 Columbia St.**

OREGON DAILY EMERALD

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published twice in September and five days a week during the academic 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.

EVERETTE DENNIS, Editor

LARRY WILLIAMS, Business Manager

JANET GOETZE, Managing Editor

JIM SPEER, Advertising Manager

RON COWAN, News Editor

DOUG RAGEN, Editorial Page Editor

CATHY NEVILLE, Academic Affairs Editor

DICK RICHARDSON, Associate Editor

JIM FRAKE, Assistant Managing Editor

RAY MAST, Sports Editor

JOE BERGER, Assistant News Editor

Editorial Board: Everette Dennis, Ron Cowan, Janet Goetze, Doug Ragen, Dick Richardson, Dave Sands, Jerry Utti, Ray Mast, Pam Pashkowski, Cathy Neville, Pat Holt, Simeon Crowther, Doug Combs, Joe Berger, Jim Frake.

Jules Feiffer

I THINK OF LIFE AS—
OH, I DON'T KNOW—
MORE OR LESS
OF A JUNGLE.



IM SORRY
BUT I CAN'T
AGREE. I
SEE LIFE
BASICALLY
AS BEING
ANXIETY
RIDDEN.

PERHAPS, BUT IN
OUR OWN WAYS
ARE WE NOT
SAVING THE
SAME THING?



I CERTAINLY
HOPE SO. I
ALWAYS THINK
THE SIGN OF
A MATURE
DEBATE IS
WHEN BOTH
PARTIES ARE
SAVING
THE SAME
THING.

QUITE SO. AND IN THAT
REGARD AM I AGGRESSIVE
BECAUSE IM ANXIOUS OR
AM I ANXIOUS BECAUSE I
FEAR THAT IM AGGRESSIVE.



GOOD POINT,
THAT! "I
FEAR, THERE-
FORE I AM."
IS THAT WHAT
YOU'RE SAY-
ING?

QUITE THE OPPOSITE.
"I AM, THEREFORE
I FEAR." THAT'S
WHAT IM SAYING.



OH, NO, NO, NO!
COMPLETELY
UNACCEPTABLE.

OH, DO YOU THINK SO? WELL,
WHY DON'T WE STEP INTO
MY CAVE AND DISCUSS
THIS OVER DINNER.



GLADLY, THERE
ARE SEVERAL
VITAL POINTS
I FEEL YOU'RE
OVERLOOKING.
FOR INSTANCE,
THE ENVIRON-
MENTAL
FACTOR.



NOW DID I DO THAT BECAUSE I
WAS ANXIOUS OR DID I DO THAT
BECAUSE I WAS AGGRESSIVE?



I HOPE ANOTHER
SMALL ANIMAL
COMES ALONG SOON.
HOW ELSE
CAN ONE
LEARN?

