

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
Rick Fitch
Gil Johnson

Linda Meierjungen
Doug Onyon
Mike Russelle
Ron Saylor

Sally Schippers
D. L. Sonnichsen
Jaqi Thompson

RICH JERNSTEDT
Advertising Director

DOUG CRICHTON
Advertising Manager

BARBARA STONE
National Advertising Manager

University of Oregon, Eugene, Monday, May 13, 1968

Monetary Sanction Hits Students

The House of Representatives' decision Thursday to deny federal loans to student demonstrators runs true to form. The so-called leaders of the nation continue to react to the nation's problems without solving them.

In the recent past the nation's demonstrations have centered on the problems of the war and the draft, and radical discrimination and poverty.

The nation has reacted by using greater force in breaking up demonstrations and by developing more powerful and efficient means of quelling riots.

Meanwhile the Vietnam war continues and consequently so does the draft. The country has provided civil rights legislation without providing jobs. The country has provided federal troops to the cities but not adequate housing.

Thus, the causes for riots cited by the Kerner report still exist.

Now another problem has been added. The focus at the moment is on college campuses where students are directing some of their activism to changes in higher education.

So what does the House of Representatives do? It passes, 306-54, an amendment allowing college authorities to deny federal aid to students participating in demonstrations.

Not only is the amendment dangerous to individual freedoms and to higher education, but it will also, we believe, be ineffective.

The amendment would bar from federal assistance any student who refuses to obey a lawful order of the college authorities and is determined by those authorities to have taken part in activities that lead to a disruption of operations at the college.

It leaves much of the interpretation up to the college authorities.

They will decide whether an order they give is lawful, whether a demonstration does in fact exist, and whether that demonstration disrupts the operations at the college. This can be done, and most likely will be done, separate from any consideration of the cause for the demonstration.

However, we have enough faith in the commitment of the students who have demonstrated on various issues on the nation's campuses that the House amendment will not alter sufficiently that commitment nor the number of students participating in demonstrations.

It merely adds to the consequences one must accept if he is to act upon his conscience. It merely adds to the alienation students have for the "system."

Students believe that certain things must be changed, and at the same time they see clearly that those within the system who can bring about the changes are failing to do so. So the students and others react in a manner that hopefully will bring immediate necessary change.

The "system" in turn acts—disapproving of the means, it continues to punish that reaction without altering the original cause of the reaction.

This is the real issue involved in our concern over the House's action. Will the nation, and its colleges, turn to changing that which needs to be changed or will it continue to turn to punishing those who are tired of waiting for change?

Footnote

It is time now to turn with all the purpose at our command to the major unfinished business of this nation. It is time to adopt strategies for action that will produce quick and visible progress. It is time to make good the promises of American democracy to all citizens—urban and rural, White and Black, Spanish-surname, American Indian, and every minority group.

... There can be no higher priority for national action and no higher claim on the nation's conscience.

—From the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders.

Warner Karshner Goals Year '68... A Beginning Towards Community Government

Editor's note: Warner Karshner is a former fraternity representative to the Senate and is now a dormitory counselor. This article deals with a plan for setting up curriculum committees on the departmental level.

Well, here we are again in the spring of the year standing around shouting at each other as the world comes tumbling about our ears. Does anybody recall last spring, or the spring before that? Does anybody recall anything before yesterday? What was happening before Johnson Hall, before Flemming, before 'The War on Poverty,' before Civil Rights? And how long will it be before we forget today...? Tomorrow?

Most of us have managed to turn learning into a series of disjointed, unrelated, discontinuous 'experiences.'

Shall we start it all again in the morning? Let's not. We're frustrated with substituting group therapy for friendship, cathartic political action for real political change, love-ins for love.

What's possible; what can be done? A group of faculty and students have been meeting this term to map out a strategy toward community. They have come up with the following suggestions for action.

● 1. A UO Community Goals Year. The plan is to take an academic year and focus all of our actions on the questions... where are we going, do we want to go there, why are we going there? The Goals Year means to include everybody that is at the University... faculty, staff, students, administrators. It means to ask where are we going individually, how can we best make use of the University community to get there.

The Goals Year is not presented as a conference or a debate, it is presented as a family affair, as a special time while the family is in crisis to ask yourself and the guy next to you what you're doing and why you're doing it. If everybody asks, nobody has to be afraid

... we'll all go together or we'll not go at all.

One of the ways to keep from being afraid is to keep the main point in your mind. The community must involve itself in a massive attention-directing campaign to make this Goals Year work.

Each member of the community can partake by running his own personal Goals Year publicity campaign — the means will differ as will the individual goals — let's just get it out in front of us so we don't start fearing to pop the question.

There's no real need to bring in speakers on this, let's find out who we've got among the family. The goals year must be a personal responsibility to get results.

Where do we do the talking? Plans are flexible at this point. The best way to shoot this down is to set it up too tight. Rather than schedule events to meet the resources, let's open up the resources to meet the events.

If somebody has something to say and wants to say it to a group let's keep open places for that to happen when it comes up. It calls for an active role rather than passive.

Where do we go from talk?

● 2. Departmental Search classes of students and faculty are being formed to convene in the fall. The purpose of these classes is to discuss curriculum in terms of the kinds of goals that are being brought out by the community.

A secondary purpose is to discuss faculty-student sharing of curriculum development responsibilities. Curriculum development is not an easy task as those students that have been involved in it can testify, but it is the basic point at which education can and is made relevant to the world. Here we can turn discussions on goals and educational policy into educational policy.

It is hoped that within these courses students and faculty can develop a sense of working trust with each other and can proceed to establish student curriculum committees to aid

faculty in their efforts to keep education up to date.

This could be scary, but needn't be if we keep the main point in mind: We've got a world that isn't going to wait on us and we are all in equal jeopardy if we don't keep up.

It's time we learned to radiate that power that we have so long tried to possess. To hold it you hide it and hidden, it isn't helping anybody, not even yourself.

For those of us concerned about the time element and the allocation of our own resources, the class time will be creditable under the present SEARCH program.

● 3. The third and last suggestion the study group proposes is that the whole shebang be done under the auspices of the Center for Experimental and Innovational Education which is planned for establishment this summer. This center, governed by faculty and students, can provide the neutral ground and back-up functions to keep the ideas going and to settle disputes.

It can also do the community-wide feedback work that will be necessary to avoid duplication. The center may also provide, with the assistance of the Emerald, campus wide communication on what is happening.

Parts of the community have already begun to mobilize themselves to deal with this effort. Individuals in the community interested in helping to plan may contact the following persons and/or attend the Monday night meeting at 10 p.m. in the basement of Hendricks Hall.

Dan Allison—Political Science 342-3780; Cliff Breslow—CSPA 345-2470; Ed Bingham—Professor of History; Dick Eymann—Political Science Ext. 1384; Randy Farleigh—Psychology Ext. 25-62; Dick Guske—CSPA 345-9858; Randy Gragg—History 345-8903 or 343-9291; Dick Jones—Journalism 343-2925; Gil Johnson—Journalism Ext. 1817 or 21-45; Bob Winger—History Ext. 1694; Jim Silver—Business Administration 747-8363; Sharyn Wisely—English 345-1137 or Ext. 1921; Warner Karshner—Psychology Ext. 1667; Phil Runkle—Professor of Psychology Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration (CASEA); John Wish—Professor of Business Administration (MIT); W. E. Schaffer Professor of Sociology.

Emerald Editor:

Third Motion

Emerald Editor:

This concerns your May 6 editorial. Actually, in the May faculty meeting, three motions were submitted on the Johnson Hall sleep-in and the composition of the Presidential Search Committee. You mentioned only two. All three will be considered by the faculty at its June meeting. The third motion asks the faculty to disassociate itself from the April 25th version of the Presidential Search Committee, and so inform all candidates contacted by this committee.

You speak of "... a great need for a joint student-faculty body to develop guidelines for student participation..." and ask that such a body "... be above and separate from any consideration of stated opinion on the Search Committee or the Johnson Hall sleep-in."

Unfortunately, the events of April 25 established that students could achieve their political objectives by what the Faculty Senate correctly described as coercion and intimidation of the University community.

As your own recent editorials have emphasized, this is a tactic that can be, and probably will be, repeated. Particularly if the faculty acquiesces in the decision reached on April 25. A whole series of recent events reported in the Emerald suggests that there serious danger of violence on this campus next year. Calm and reasoned judgment about student involvement may well have died a silent death on April 25.

But the faculty does not at

present seem concerned. It is quite possible that the faculty will follow your recommendations at its June meeting. Unless it can be prodded awake in the meantime to what actually happened on April 25.

Arthur L. Thomas
Associate Professor
Chris J. Lunski
Associate Professor

Illegal Ad

Emerald Editor:

I know that some people on campus have been irritated lately by the problems you seem to have in allocating space in the Emerald to various features.

For instance, the Co-op Board meeting was reported almost a week after it took place and so much front-page space was devoted to the sleep-in that Three Days of Concern (the recent conference on Vietnam) received inadequate coverage. Monday's issue contains something that looks like it has also been the victim of your space problem—and it cannot be laid on the shoulders of the previous editor, Mr. Fancher, as the above cited incidents can; it is your problem.

On page five is an ad concerning Monday's school election. I honestly believe that your staff has not meant to do anything wrong, but because of space allocation problems, they have. It is illegal to print ads concerning election issues on the day when the election for that issue is being held.

I hope you can see to it that such a problem does not arise when the primary election is being held. (If you desire

verification of the point of law mentioned, you can obtain it by checking with the district attorney, the secretary of state or the state attorney general.)

Clark Cox
Junior, Social Science

Cheers for ROTC

Emerald Editor:

As a veteran my chest swelled with pride when I read in Sunday's Register-Guard that the fine University of Oregon Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC) drill team snared first place in the Oakridge Tree Festival Parade.

They bested such formidable competition as the Willamalane baton twirlers and the Oakridge 4-H club, who finish second and third respectively.

Such training is invaluable in the development of future officers for the United States Army. All veterans, students, as well as the general public, should be proud of the University ROTC drill team's splendid showing last weekend. Keep up the good work, men!

Guy Strahan
Junior, Liberal Arts

Sick University

Emerald Editor:

I would like to write in defense of my father's name, as well as that of my own. (Though I confess it makes me feel weird to triple space this as I type it.)

It came as no surprise to me that two students should take pen in hand (or in this case, typewriter—no pun intended) to attack my father. No matter
(Continued on page 7)