

# Faculty Should Open the Doors...

"Not fair" cried some faculty members after the Emerald and the Register-Guard pointed out that at their last meeting the faculty voted to keep out the Emerald and then passed a motion attacking clandestine or covert operations. But the meetings aren't clandestine, say some faculty members. We release what we decide, they add. "The meetings are just private," said one.

Well, our dictionary defines clandestine as "secret" or "concealed." Faculty meetings certainly are that. We only know the final decisions. We don't know anything about the discussion. For that matter, we have to go on good faith the faculty really tells us what happened. It's like covering the Viet Nam war using only press releases handed out by the Defense Department and trying to give the whole picture. For the faculty certainly manages the news of its meetings just as the U.S. government manages the news of Viet Nam.

Those reactionary faculty members who oppose open meetings keep saying that press coverage will destroy their scholarly privacy. But we aren't asking to cover their classroom lectures. Nor is this a meeting of a private group. The faculty is carrying out public laws which give them the power to set curriculum, student discipline rules, etc.

Many faculty members keep implying that there is something especially great about the things that are said and that the discussion would be inhibited by the presence of the press and public. But a lot of other faculty members, including some who oppose opening the meetings, keep asking why we want to get in. They tell us the meetings are full of parliamentary haggling, nitpicking, and irrelevant discussion. Arthur Pearl, professor of education, probably summed up that feeling when he said recently that if the meetings ever were opened the faculty would probably have to give trading stamps to get anybody to come.

Perhaps, if the discussions are really that bad, a little public exposure might improve the quality of discussion. Maybe the real reason some faculty members oppose opening their meeting is that they are afraid of having their ineffectiveness displayed before all the campus. Or, if the discussion is as great as some of the others say it is, then all these great words ought to be heard not only by faculty members but the rest of us so that we might become better enlightened.

But exposing faculty members as idiots and improving the quality of discussion aren't why we want to get in. Almost every matter the faculty looks at is of vital interest to students and the rest of the academic community. Take today's agenda—creation of a new degree, the course evaluation project, eligibility for student office, stadium seating—these are all matters to deep interest to students. They have the right to know the discussion and deliberations that go into the final decision.

Despite the few reactionaries who oppose opening the meetings and despite the fact that the faculty has voted against opening the meetings three times in a year, we think a majority of faculty members really want the meetings opened. We hope that this majority will act today to end the policy of clandestine meetings. And they should do it as soon as possible. Too much important business has already been done behind closed doors. The time is long past to open them.

## ... Ask Better Student Seating...

When University President Arthur S. Flemming considers the question of student seating in the new stadium, he's going to have a thick stack of recommendations. Just about everybody has put in their two cents worth. Today, hopefully, the University faculty make their recommendation. It should be one of the most important.

The key point for the faculty—and the main reason they should even be interested—is the place of athletics in the University community.

The kind of seating students get in that stadium will be a good indicator of where athletics fit in. If students get crammed into the end zone, that can be read that our athletic program is primarily there to make money and serve the sportswriters and sports fans. If students are given sideline seats equal to those that everybody else gets, that can be read as saying that intercollegiate athletics' primary purpose is still the entertainment of students. As such, it has a legitimate place in the University.

Athletic Department officials have moaned that they need those seats the students want in order to sell season tickets and make enough money to support the athletic program.

# Oregon Daily Emerald

Opinions expressed on the editorial page are those of the Emerald and do not necessarily represent the opinions of the ASUO or the University. However, the Emerald does present on this page columnists and letter writers whose opinions reflect those of our diverse readership and not those of the Emerald itself.

PHIL SEMAS, Editor

WILBUR BISHOP JR.  
Business Manager  
RICH JERNSTEDT  
Advertising Manager  
CLIFF SANDERLIN  
Associate Editor

ANNETTE BUCHANAN  
Managing Editor  
MIKE FANCHER  
News Editor  
JEAN SNIDER  
Editorial Page Editor

University of Oregon, Eugene, Wednesday, April 5, 1967

They point out that they've already committed a lot of good seats to those who contributed money to the stadium and who contribute to the department's grant-in-aid program. But those seats aren't being given away. They're being sold and all those contributors have a first option to buy them.

Autzen Stadium is much bigger than Hayward Field or Portland's Multnomah Stadium. The Athletic Department has managed to make a profit every year in those stadia and give students seats from the 50 yard line on around the end zone. We don't understand why they shouldn't be able to make as much money giving students the same kind of seating in a bigger stadium.

Since the Athletic Department ought to be able to make enough money and assuming the faculty wants athletics to remain in its proper place in the academic community, the faculty has two courses open. They can pass the motion by James Klonoski and D. J. Finlay, associate professors of political science asking for seating between the 30 yard lines. Or they can endorse the ASUO Senate's proposal to give students 55 yards of sideline seating, from one 45 yard line to the end zone.

They should keep in mind, however, that the ASUO Senate proposal is already a compromise. According to ASUO President Henry Drummonds, most senators actually wanted something like the faculty proposal but they decided to compromise that with the original plans which put the best student seats on the 30 yard line. Perhaps the faculty will want to come out for the most liberal plan.

But whichever course they take, we think University faculty members should definitely come out for good student seats in the stadium.

## ... And Say Nothing About Evaluations

After the University faculty in February adopted a motion endorsing the idea of a survey of student reactions to courses and faculty members, everyone assumed the issue was dead. Not. So. For comes now Robert Summers, associate professor of law, with a new motion on the issue.

The Summers motion is two pages long and is loaded with words (three "whereas" clauses with three or four points under each one). One point that needs clarification is that Summers asks that faculty members not be forced to give up use of the classroom and classroom time for the project. This has already been decided. A faculty member has the option of not using class time and having students bring back the form later.

But that's not the brunt of the Summers' motion. Its main point is to recommend that President Flemming prohibit the ASUO from publishing an evaluation of a faculty member against his will. Summers bases this request on the fact that Flemming has allocated "state funds" (although they are student fees) and has provided assistance of University staff members in conducting the evaluation.

But for the president to do what Summers suggests and for the faculty to ask the president to do such a thing would conflict with the long-standing tradition of a free student press on this campus. For the ASUO's Course Survey Bulletin is no less a student publication than the Emerald, which also receives student fee funds and some staff assistance, particularly in business matters.

President Flemming has long had a policy, which we always assumed was supported by most faculty members, that the University doesn't interfere with the content of a student publication. We would like to think that the staunch defenders of academic freedom who make up the University faculty would also be staunch defenders of a free press. If so, then the faculty should not want to decide what student government can and cannot publish in a student publication. Faculty members who feel they are badly treated do, of course, always have the option of going to the courts.

The faculty made a good statement on course evaluation when they passed Professor Aaron Novick's motion in February. In that motion they left it up to the students to run their own evaluation project, although they did encourage individual faculty members to participate. The faculty should leave it at that. They don't need to say anything else.

## Emerald Editor:

All letters to the editor must be typewritten and double spaced. Letters must not exceed 300 words and must be signed in ink, giving the class and major of the writer. Those dealing with one subject and pertaining to the University or Eugene community will be given preference. The Emerald reserves the right to edit letters for style, grammar, punctuation, and potentially libelous content. Letters not meeting these criteria and those which are mimeographed or otherwise obvious duplicates will be returned.

### Stolen!

Emerald Editor:

My master's thesis has come to a screeching halt. The source for most of the imagery and ideas in my thesis project has vanished and consequently so has my project.

The volume, with which I was working, Eros, a rare and limited publication, is worth a great deal of money, approximately \$70. I am asking for its return—so that I may finish my thesis and return the book to its rightful owner.

Jeff Stewart  
Graduate Student,  
Painting and Drawing

### New Generation

Emerald Editor:

Representative Thornton: Re: The bill on restriction of campus speakers.

What you advocate is clearly an abridgement of the right to free speech.

According to an Emerald article on the front page of the March 28 issue, you want that "speakers who advocate breaking the law should be barred from campus speeches."

What are you going to do about such things as H. D. Thoreau's article "On the Duty of Civil Disobedience"? He advocated breaking the law if the law was wrong.

You will probably suggest at this point that the law be changed by popular vote. You fail to consider that 18-year-olds cannot vote.

And if they sent their ideas in to you or another representative, they would probably be shrugged off as "irresponsible students trying to raise a big stink."

First, there are many students that are completely or almost completely self-supporting, and they are not completely irresponsible.

Second, if the students suggested something that you did not believe in, you could just ignore it and nothing would get done.

Another point to consider is that perhaps the post-war generation has decided to set up new standards, different from those of the previous generation.

You may wonder why the new generation wants to do this. It is simple and has been explained before. We don't like the world that you left for us so we want a chance to deal with the problems in our own way.

Added to all of this is the natural curiosity of what and how radical people think, and what relationship our thinking has with theirs.

I would like to ask you to consider these things before you criticize the things we do here at the University of Oregon, Oregon State, and Portland State (also: SOC, EOC, etc.).

Remember, we have to live in this world, too.

Gerald Sanders  
Sophomore, Mathematics

### Oregon Daily Emerald

Ron Eachus, Sports Editor  
Tom Thompson, Photo Editor  
Sally Sharrard, Feature Editor  
Paul Polsky, Associate Sports Editor  
Chris Houghum, Entertainment Editor  
Lee O'Conner,  
Women's Affairs Editor  
Jaqi Thompson,  
Political Affairs Editor