

Future Depends on Students

Enrollment Determines University Budgets

In making plans for next year administrators must make many predictions. They must estimate income and expenses, the number and types of courses to be offered, faculty requirements and policy changes. But the focal point in higher education planning is, as it should be, the estimate of next year's student population.

A university needs students and, generally, the more the better. During the past few years educators have feared that some day there would be too many students. We've heard threats about "war babies" invading college campuses. Teen-agers have been warned about "the closing college door." And admissions directors and high school counselors have told today's frightened youths about increased admission standards. As a result it's easy to get the impression that colleges and universities are trying to discourage students from attending institutions of higher education. This isn't the case. However, colleges are looking for better qualified students—those that are prepared to gain the most from their four-year journey through the academic jungle.

The University isn't looking for methods to keep students away. On the contrary, President Flemming indicated only last week that we must have an enrollment of at least 10,525 this fall if we are to avoid further budget cuts. Next year's operating budget is based on that number of students. If fewer students come next fall, the state legislature will give the University less money. For each student under the anticipated quota, the University loses approximately \$600 in revenues from the state.

Distinguished Professors

This year's recipient of the Ersted Award for Distinguished Teaching will receive recognition as an outstanding member of a faculty which contains many highly-qualified members. Appointments and awards made to faculty members this year have included two Guggenheim fellowships, the award for the Outstanding Young Chemist of the Year, and an appointment to the Institute of Advanced Study at Princeton University. The Ersted award will be presented to a relatively young member of this faculty who has demonstrated exceptional ability to induce students to reason rather than memorize.

Past recipients of the award have included professor-scholars with distinguished records of research and scholarly publications. Former winners have included Charles G. Howard, professor emeritus of the Law School, John Hulteng, a past Nei-

If the money doesn't materialize, we will be forced to cut back where we can. Because of drastic cuts this year (primarily in University relations activities and physical plant maintenance) there are fewer places where budgets can be trimmed easily next year. Although it's not likely that any faculty members will be fired, new or replacement staff members may not be hired. If necessary, some classes and program offerings will have to be dropped.

The president's office has pointed out repeatedly that a whole series of cutbacks could become necessary without adequate state support. One of the first things would be increased work loads on faculty and staff and fewer offerings to students. If budgets have to be cut again, there will be less "elbow room" because of the cuts already made this year.

But Flemming is optimistic. He says he is convinced that our enrollment will grow along with population expansion throughout the state. He says the increase will be "sharp" and eventually we'll have a problem in trying to provide living accommodations for everyone. Presently the number of new students who have been provisionally admitted for fall term is 14 per cent ahead of last year at this time. However, the number of dormitory reservations is 28 per cent behind a year ago.

Our interest in large enrollments should not be interpreted to mean we're trying to show off or compete with other state schools. We need students in order to maintain our present level of support and to continue programs through the next year.

We need students. We need at least 10,525 this fall.

man fellow and Dean of the Journalism School, Lucian Marquis, director of the Honors College, Stanley Greenfield, a scholar and author of frequent journal articles, and David Baernkopf, recently appointed head of the department of accounting and business.

Students and faculty members are currently submitting nominations for this year's awards. We are proud that the University has such a tradition which recognizes one of the most important principles of modern education, creative thinking as opposed to memorization. As the size of institutions of higher education continues to increase it becomes more important that the content of subject matter does not become stereotyped. These past Ersted award winners have contributed to the tradition of inquiry. We are proud of them and are hopeful that deserving professors will continue to be recognized in this manner.

Herblock



"Precisely, General—In This Space Age It's Not Enough To Be Able To Destroy Only One Planet"

Letters to the Editor

Inconsistencies?

Emerald Editor:

After reading John Luvaas' column in Monday's Emerald I was prompted to respond. If anyone wishes to check the Senate records which are in the ASUO office in the SU, he will find that John Luvaas voted against the majority report on student conduct last spring. Evidently John felt the rising student agitation regarding his manner of voting on this issue was so strong that he should "justify his position." Last Monday afternoon, about 60 students heard John speak.

He pointed out the five major headings of the conduct code, saying that he disagreed with the fourth: "4) the conduct of female students on campus should not be any more restrictively controlled than those of the male students . . ."

He stated, "We must admit that men and women have a separate role in society." Is that so? And even if it were, I would like to ask John what has forced this separation . . . other than our culture? Where else is 'progressive' action supposed to occur than on our university campuses?

John constantly maintained that the new code is ineffective. It is my opinion, based on the way he voted and the "wrongs" he asserted are inherent in the New Code that John picks out the few minor administrative problems (and I would like to be shown some policy in any bureaucratic government without problems) and maintains the entire code is ineffective . . .

Lil Rebut
Sophomore, pre-law

And You, Mr. Wight?

Emerald Editor:

I enjoyed the honorable Senator Barry Wight's novice effort of criticism in Monday's Emerald. The necessary editor's note straightened out his thinking on several points, but neglected other pertinent sections of his composition.

Good old Barry blazonly commented that "the senators . . . did not bring the importance of the new constitution to the student body," but he apparently overlooked an obvious point—he (Barry) is, himself, a senator. Perhaps he should try a little harder in leading his cohorts. Face up to your obligations Barry, use not a scapegoat.

Senator Wight's second effort was a gross of misinformation. He ostentatiously mentioned that "Ron Cowin, Student Government Committee Chairman, visited the Greeks but managed to neglect the independent dorm vote." This is not true,

Barry—you're wrong again. Mr. Cowin not only visited many dorms (including Walton, Hamilton, Straub, and Earl complexes) but also personally phoned residents in each dorm, asking them to urge students to vote.

Ron Cowin is only one man, Barry; he couldn't cover the entire campus by himself, but at least he tried. Since the new constitution was passed in the Senate, it was the obligation of each senator to urge the students to vote—what did you do, Barry Wight?

Steve Ashton
Constitution Revision
Committee Member

Letters to Editor Policy Statement

Letters to the editor are due in The Emerald Office, 301 Allen Hall, by noon of the day prior to publication. Priority is given to shorter letters.

Letters should not exceed 250 words and should bear the name, status and address of the writer. The Emerald accepts letters from anyone but gives priority to those letters from members of the University community or of direct concern to the University.

All letters should be typewritten and double spaced. Names of writers can be withheld upon request. Letters bearing names of more than five persons are run with only the first name on the list. Other names are kept on file in the editor's office.

The Emerald reserves the right to edit letters.

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 opinions of the ASUO or the University.

EVERETTE DENNIS, Editor
JIM SPEER, Business Manager
JANET GOETZE, Managing Editor
MARIE FORRESTER, Advertising Manager
RON COWAN, News Editor
CATHY NEVILLE, Academic Affairs Editor
DICK RICHARDSON, Associate Editor
JIM FRAKE, Assistant Managing Editor
DAVE JORDAN, Assistant News Editor
RAY MAST, Sports Editor
GEORGE BIGHAM, Photo Editor
CHUCK BEGGS, Entertainment Editor

Letters to the Editor

New Method

Emerald Editor:

Have the Communists developed a new method to carry on their attack upon the United States Constitution and government?

Recent events in Oregon and elsewhere raise this question as a real possibility. What would the method be? Very simply to advocate or compliment a person, program or constitutional principle which the Communists really wanted to damage or destroy.

How would the method work? If the Communists are afraid the Civil Rights Bill will ease tensions in the United States and negate one of their favorite criticisms of the United States

abroad, the party would announce in some way that it favored the bill. And a knee jerk response would follow on the part of all too many Americans: "They say they are for it. It must be a plot. We oppose, we oppose."

If the Communists want to weaken the Supreme Court and the Constitution, they can say something nice about Earl Warren or a recent decision and print the compliments on the front page of the Daily Worker. The automatic reactionary will take it from there . . .

If they are worried about the ACLU's insistence that the Constitution's protections and guarantees be accorded to every person, no matter how lowly, outcast or offensive, all they have

to do is ask the ACLU to intervene for a few Communists where constitutional principles are involved . . .

That this method would allow the Communists to be effective while supporting reasonable and proper causes or principles would be irony enough. But the real irony is that the method makes servants of staunch foes. The money, effort and labor to obtain the Communist goal would be supplied by the automatic reactionary.

The solution, of course, is to judge each case on its own merits, not by who says they are for or against.

Edward N. Fadeley
State Senator