

# Community Government Next Year?

Community government and an equal faculty-student share in the decision making process can soon become a reality at the University if the Faculty-Senate and the ASUO are willing to back their words with action.

We have said we believe the sleep-in in Johnson Hall last week was a step toward community government

If nothing else, it stimulated dialogue on community government.

Within the remaining month of the term students and faculty can take further steps toward establishing community government.

The food for dialogue is there.

The ASUO and others have talked of community government for several years.

The reasons why students should have an equal share with the faculty in making decisions have been pronounced time and time again. Both the students and the faculty share an interest in the educational process of this institution. And students should have a share in making the decisions that will affect their education and their lives here at the University.

The faculty is responsible for the University curriculum, for academic requirements and for scholarship requirements. It is also responsible for student activities and student conduct.

In these areas which directly affect them, the students still have very little say in making decisions, particularly where general policy is concerned.

In January we printed the full text of proposed guidelines for faculty-student participation in governing the academic community. Sponsors of that proposal included six faculty members, four graduate students and Lee Bollinger, the 1966-67 ASUO vice-president.

That proposal outlines general principles and implementation of joint participation of students and teachers in decision making through faculty-student committees.

The agreement between Lieuallen and the students over the Presidential Search Committee added further to the dialogue on community government.

However, as the statement by the Faculty-Senate shows, that agreement brought about an unanswered question about community government.

Does community government mean equal share of participation between three groups (the faculty, the administration, and the students) or between two groups (the students and the faculty)?

The Faculty-Senate said in its statement there is no sharp distinction between administration, as defined for purposes of the committee, and the faculty. Administration was defined as deans of schools and heads of departments.

The formulation of a faculty-administration dichotomy would not be "in the best interests of the University" the statement said.

We agree with the Faculty-Senate. We believe, as the statement implies, that community government should be based upon faculty and students sharing equally in decision making, not students, faculty and administration.

But we are more concerned with another opinion stated by the Faculty-Senate. The statement expressed concern that the Johnson Hall sleep-in jeopardized "the orderly development of workable relationships, based on mutual respect, between faculty and students at the University."

In the statement the Faculty-Senate urged that "further questions of University policy on which students ought to be heard be settled by reasoned discussion and negotiation between the official,

elected or duly appointed agencies of the faculty and of the Associated Students of the University of Oregon."

With this statement in mind we reiterate a recommendation of the proposed guidelines mentioned previously. Those guidelines recommended regularized student participation in certain regular faculty committees. But it also recommended a special Committee on Academic Legislation to explore plans for a legislative body of faculty and students to deal with all matters now delegated to the faculty.

This committee was to be formed once faculty-student participation was implemented and was to present a final plan two years later.

However, in view of the Faculty-Senate's commitment to reasoned discussion and negotiation we believe it feasible and necessary to establish such a committee as soon as possible.

Therefore we call for the immediate implementation of a committee to discuss and negotiate a plan for community government at the University to be initiated at the beginning of the next fiscal year.

This committee should at least be composed of 1) students appointed through the ASUO, which the Faculty-Senate recognizes as representing the students. 2) members of the Faculty-Senate who adopted the recent statement. These members to be appointed by the Faculty-Senate. 3) sponsors of the proposed guidelines for faculty-student participation.

Further details of the make-up of the committee can be worked out by the ASUO and the Faculty-Senate.

We challenge the ASUO and the Faculty-Senate to participate in such an effort to establish community government at the University through channels recognized as legitimate.

Julia Yoder, Marla Vandewater

## Take a Look Around You

**Editor's note:** We have received several letters, all over the 300 word minimum, responding to a letter printed in the Thursday, April 18, issue of the Emerald written by Jerry Seranton, a graduate in Library Science.

Due to the fact that Seranton's letter listed a series of points all which the letter writers felt needed rebutting, we are foregoing the standard word limit and printing this one.

In his letter, Seranton suggests the Blacks discontinue "their vilification of Caucasian social attitudes. He raises a number of pointed questions directed at the crime rate, illegitimacy, venereal disease rate, education, and general attitude of Black people as he sees it. He ends by saying, "Do something for yourself and by yourself."

We would like to take this opportunity to thank Mr. Seranton for so eloquently defining the consequences of the social, economic and political stranglehold White America has on the Black man.

With reference to your "embarrassing questions" let us consider the following:

(1) As any general sociology text will confirm the high arrest and conviction rates of Black people are in part due to discrimination; it has been proven that law enforcement of Blacks is characteristically severe. The remaining difference in crime rates is merely a class variation — the majority of Black people being in the lower socio-economic brackets in which crime rates are highest. Studies have shown that Black and White crime rates in slum areas are approximately the same.

(2) We note that you failed to mention in your lengthy discourse the low employment rate of the Black man. Stokely Carmichael links inavailability of jobs to the breakdown of the Black family structure: "Many men who are unable to find employment leave their homes so that their wives can qualify for Aid to Dependent Children or welfare."

(3) The venereal disease rate

might possibly relate to the fact that statistics are taken from public health services rather than the private physicians to which diseased White people go.

(4) Concerning the number of Black youths who graduate from (inadequate) educational institutions—since when has a diploma enhanced the position of a Black man in the community?

(5) Do you, Mr. Seranton, know the illegitimate birth rate of any people living in overcrowded slum conditions? Welfare studies show that a large percentage of slum inhabitants either are unaware of or have no access to birth control measures.

(6) Like you, Mr. Seranton, Stokely Carmichael is concerned about muggings and robbery in the Black community: "Children growing up in a welfare situation often leave school because of a lack of incentive or because they do not have enough food to eat or clothes to wear.

They in turn go out to seek jobs but find a more negative situation than their fathers faced. So they turn to petty crime, pushing dope, prostitution (joining the Army if possible), and the cycle continues."

(7) You spoke of Black people burning their neighbor's homes — consider who their neighbors are: whose homes and whose property?

(8) We think it very observant of you, Mr. Seranton, to note that Black people did not build the environment in which they are forced to live. White America has generously provided the Black man with the ghetto. Perhaps he would be more inclined to preserve a community which he himself had built.

(Continued on page 7)

Marc Levy

## Tongue Point Center Seen As Ineffective

**Editor's note:** The following is a column submitted by Marc Levy, a sophomore in liberal arts. Levy expresses concern with the way that the Tongue Point Women's Job Corps is being run.

What is the Job Corps? According to the program handbook put out by Tongue Point "The women's Job Corps considers its objectives to be threefold: education for family membership; education for employability and education for citizenship in the broader sense."

It also states "The Tongue Point program will provide Corpswomen with the environmental influences they can expect to experience within society. Educational experiences will be developed which will enable the Corpswomen to internalize behavior patterns conducive to effective functioning within the broader democratic society."

After visiting Tongue Point, seeing their programs and talking to numerous girls involved in the program; it can be said that the girls have high regard for the classes and the opportunity to continue their education. However, it was also obvious to the girls and the University students that several of the programs were not being run effectively. There was an evident gap between what was being stated as policy and what was really being done.

One of the biggest problems is that the administration treats these girls as if they were in a detention home rather than a voluntary educational institution. For example the girls cannot leave the base on Mondays or Tuesday, and on the weekdays that they can leave they must be back on base by 10:00 p.m. On weekends they must be back by 12:00 p.m. It does not seem unfair until one realizes that these girls are between the ages of 16-22 and the average age is 19. Besides the curfew, no dates are allowed on the base. The girls dates must leave them at the gate and the girls must walk over half a mile to the closest dorm. On the rare occasion that there is a dance on the base it starts at 7:30 and ends at 10:30. Once a Jobs Corps man or woman comes to the dance, they are not allowed to leave until it is over. No unauthorized person allowed on the base.

The Corps women and men are treated like animals rather than human beings. They are not at all confronted with as the handbook states "Environmental influences they can expect to experience within society." As one administrator stated "Their behavior can be changed in the same way Pavlov conditioned his dogs, by repetition of behavior until it becomes normal."

Since the University gets federal funds for the running of Tongue Point it must take immediate action to change the policies which at the present time takes away these girls human dignity. It is time the University became involved in the programs and education of these girls. The time has come for the University to fulfill its obligations.



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.

RON EACHUS, Editor  
ASSOCIATE EDITORS

John Anderson	Linda Meierjurgan	Sally Schippers
Rick Fitch	Doug Onyon	D. L. Sonnichsen
Gil Johnson	Mike Russelle	Jaqi Thompson
	Ron Saylor	

RICH JERNSTEDT  
Advertising Director

DOUG CRICHTON  
Advertising Manager

BARBARA STONE  
National Advertising Manager