

White hats the rage

It's the good guys that don't go wrong. Governor Tom McCall, in an anxious move to avoid wearing a Nixon black hat, has asked the State Emergency Board to consider cutbacks of state construction projects. The projects, including a University Behavioral Science and Education complex, were approved by the 1969 legislature.

The sudden move to fight inflation and to comply with a proposed Nixon cutback of 75 per cent for federal construction projects may keep McCall on the Nixon bandwagon, but Oregon and its economy may not be playing when the game is finished.

McCall has said state construction cutbacks would be over 20 per cent, not quite in the Nixon range, but sign of more than token effort on the part of Oregon to fight inflation.

That's just fine for the national image, but Oregonians don't still use one-room schoolhouses and gallop down muddy trails. We need highways, school buildings, and other modern conveniences essential to a growing economy.

McCall's method of involving Oregon in national policy commitments leave much to be desired when considering the details of the move.

The projects that may be cut back by the State Emergency Board today were approved by the state legislature after going through the normal committee, agency, and individual department planning procedures.

Governor McCall has since decided to reverse the decisions made by the legislature, through action he hopes the Emergency Board will take.

However, his right to reverse legislative decisions is being questioned. Can the Governor decide to annul a legislative decision at will, after the legal veto period has passed? An interesting question. State Senator Edward Fadeley of Eugene has asked state Attorney General Lee Johnson if such a move is possible. Johnson's opinion on the issue may cause some lack of faith in the American legislative system, particularly if it is determined that political prestige has the power to reverse or delay legislative decisions.

Maybe wearing a white hat in Washington is the fashion, but Governor McCall should realize a strong Oregon economy is the more practical style in the long run.

Lance Carten

Critique: International Education Center

Editors note: Lance Carden is a graduate student in English. He volunteered to act as a counselor for the International Education Center's orientation program for foreign students this fall.

For many foreign students the first indication of what to expect from America in general, and the University of Oregon in particular, is a one week orientation during new student week. The program, which is supposed to help prepare foreign students to live and study here, is run by the International Education Center (IEC), a student-controlled agency of the ASUO.

In many respects, this year's Orientation, was a success. If I dwell only on the failures, it is not because I choose to ignore the successes, but because the successes of the program are generally recognized while the failures are not.

It is interesting to speculate on the impression of America which these newcomers receive. Despite the fact that much has occurred in the recent past to indicate that America is a multi-dimensional society, the IEC program gave the visitors an exceptionally one-sided view of American life. The first scheduled activity set the pattern. It was a trip to Farrell's Ice Cream Parlour. At Farrell's, the serving ritual for such fancy orders is spectacular, if corny. A tray is hoisted onto the shoulders of two waiters, dressed in pseudo-Western clothes, who run with the goodies pell-mell through the entire building accompanied by a deafening drum roll, and finally alight at the table which has ordered the "house specialty."

THE AMERICAN WAY

There's nothing wrong with visiting Farrell's (or Sambo's—or McDonald's). It reflects one side of American life, and whether it is a good or a bad side is irrelevant. It is one-sided, however. And so were the other scheduled off-campus events: a party, a picnic, a city tour which was organized by the Jaycees and which introduced the foreigners to City Hall, the Mayor, and (in one case at least) to the local Cadillac dealership.

Besides campus and library tours, the visiting students heard a lot of speeches. There were speeches on "Financial Aid and Employment," "Banking and Financial Procedures," "Insurance Programs and Social Security," "Personal Health Habits of Western Cultures," and "American Social Culture." (The titles pretty well speak for them-

Letters

Remain silent?

Emerald Editor:

Apparently the University as a community of scholars dedicated to education, i.e., the process of training and developing one's knowledge, skills, mind and character, cannot comment socially and politically on the issues of our times.

In the words of President Clark, "the University should not enter into questions of public debate." Of course not, we should be trained in passivity and acquiescence in the good old American tradition of mediocrity.

He states further, "the University should have effect on social problems through its regular processes." Certainly, the lecture hall, the biology lab, and the reserve book reading room offer the student and scholar vast resources for actively combating social evils—I dare say a comic book provides greater inspiration to social action if only because the themes of humor are current.

I do not dispute President Clark's claim that a University stance may usurp the individual's right of freedom of expression and therefore, that such a stance should be cautiously taken. Yet when unified, massive and vocal support for such issues as the Vietnam moratorium and the Delano grape boycott by the individuals who comprise the University community, is demonstrated, then how long Mr. President can the University as an institution remain muffled?

How long will the demands for social and political comment by the University be subordinated to the "greater issues" of fund raising, and a right image?

Those in business, industry and government who have been co-opted by the powers-that-be and hence must fall into line for the security of their jobs and careers remain silent and obedient. We in the University environment should have no such fears, for we are here to learn and to analyze the society in which we live.

The universities in other countries have almost always been agents for social reform, or at least the catalysts for reform on the part the institutions of business, industry, and government themselves. Would you have us stagnate, Mr. President, in a satel-

lite of ivory while the world turns beneath us? We want no Academic Curtain.

**R. M. Kovak
Graduate, Political Science**

Kick-out dead wood

Emerald Editor:

The article relating Mr. Morgan's meeting with the Sociology Student Union (Emerald, Oct. 2, 1969) contained reference to Summerhill.

Mr. A. S. Neil's laissez-faire school in the countryside of England drew to it primarily young people who somehow failed to learn at more traditional schools.

That school had its tremendous successes and its more questionable successes. Neil was most delighted when one or two students' interest would be sparked, they would come to him or one of the other faculty members, and the opportunity would be used to inculcate some learning.

But think of Neil's great pride upon discovering one of his non-reader boys who, after several years of apparently doing nothing, was found studying a physics text in his room. Summerhill had its student government, of course, which was a learning experience for all the students.

But students didn't run Summerhill. Mr. Neil did. Students didn't tell the faculty what to teach, etc. The atmosphere was a very congenial one in which the students had a clear understanding of their position and of the faculty's role.

How well I remember my first years of college and how well qualified I was to tell the faculty what, when and how to teach. But as a student I have always been in college to learn from those who are supposed to know something through previous and continuous study of their field and through actual field experience.

I have expected a significant return on my investment in time, effort and money. I have felt I was being short-changed in classes where the instructor made the "kick-off" only to let the students carry the ball for the rest of the term.

I have also felt cheated when, though the instructor had the experience and supposedly had

the learning, he actually got little or nothing across to me through lecture.

One ought not expect to hear what he already knows or even what he agrees with, but one does expect to hear something significant. A student will conscientiously learn from conscientiously done, well-planned assignments, but he hates to waste three or four hours a week in class just to find out what the assignments are.

How about letting those who know their stuff do their thing, and concentrate on getting rid of all the dead wood?

L. Craigstone

Moratorium points

Emerald Editor:

We wish to make three points concerning the forthcoming Vietnam moratorium.

1) We support the moratorium and we will participate in the moratorium by not conducting classes and laboratory sessions on the day of the moratorium.

2) We think that it is not proper for the President of the University to order the members of the University community to participate in an expression of political views. Officially cancelling all classes in connection with the moratorium would be tantamount to such an order. We approve of President Clark's decision to leave the choice of participation up to each individual, as we believe he has done.

3) The decision by President Clark to take no official action with respect to the moratorium does not in any way prevent us as individuals from fully participating in the moratorium.

W. Cadbury

**Associate Professor,
English
Thomas Hovet
Head, Political Science
Department
R. S. Harris
Head, Architecture
Department
Richard Littman
Professor, Psychology
Aaron Novick
Professor, Biology
George Streisinger
Co-chairman, Biology
Department**

The position and departments are cited for purposes of identification only.

selves, though some were more harmless than they sound.) Kenneth Ghent, foreign student advisor, welcomed the newcomers and Sonja Sweek gave a short speech which emphasized the need for foreign students to return to their native countries and put their talents and knowledge to use where they will count the most.

DISCRIMINATION AMERICAN TOO

It was left to Dominic LaRusso, a speech professor, to discuss the subject of discrimination with the visitors during his luncheon address on "American Social Culture." LaRusso didn't try to deny that discrimination exists in America, but maintained that there was no more discrimination here than abroad, and that America's record in this regard is very enviable. He mentioned the discrimination which met Italian immigrants when they arrived in America, and said that the very fact that he, the son of Italian immigrants, was now a college professor was an indication of America's progress.

LaRusso's opinions about America's social problems and achievements are open to question, but he is to be congratulated on one point: he was willing to speak publicly to foreign students about American social problems. He was the only person during the orientation who did. Neither LaRusso nor anyone else made any effort to inform foreign students how to defend themselves against prejudice. LaRusso merely reminded his audience that they shouldn't expect to find the U.S. free of the racial prejudices rampant throughout the world.

There was no effort to advise the newcomers, many of them from Asia and Africa, of their rights under law — no effort to explain the complicated and sometimes clumsy machinery which is designed to protect those rights. The advice to the students counselors from one representative of the Foreign Student Office concerning questions about private housing was to strongly recommend the dormitories to all foreign students.

EXPEDIENCY DOES THE JOB

Given Eugene's general housing situation, that may or may not be good advice; but it is certainly very expedient advice to give a foreign student. It avoids the unpleasant and time-consuming task of actually helping someone who has problems finding an apartment. On April 28 Eugene passed a city ordinance against racial discrimination in housing and employment. Shouldn't an effort to

prepare foreign students to live and study here include at least a reference to this ordinance?

But, it will be maintained, that there were forty student volunteer counselors at the Orientation who could have answered the questions of individual foreign students concerning such subjects. The fact is that the counselors (whose services cost IEC \$1800 in room and board alone) were incompetent in this regard. Picked on the basis of their knowledge of foreign countries, languages, and students, the counselors were overwhelmingly ignorant and generally unconcerned about racial discrimination in America. (Several of them tried to convince me that there were no racial barriers in Eugene, especially in housing.)

Exceptions to the rule were the few returning foreign students who attended the orientation. At first they seemed to be a valuable resource, but when I asked two of them to lead a discussion of the racial problems the new foreign students could expect to encounter, they declined, protesting that as visitors here it was not their place to lead such a discussion. Both of them were concerned, however, and expressed their disappointment in this aspect of the Orientation Program.

HARD-SELL—POOR-SELL

What can or should be done to improve the program? I'm not sure because I am not familiar with the IEC and its operation. There are a few suggestions inherent in some of the comments I have made, but my comments probably don't go to the heart of the problem and the real reasons for the artificiality of the orientation.

Like many of the counselors, I was selected because I had lived and studied abroad. When I volunteered, I had no idea of the structured nature of the program. Throughout the week, I had an uneasy suspicion that I had mistakenly volunteered for the USIA or the Peace Corps. Fortunately, as far as I know, there is no connection between either ASUO or IEC and these agencies. Is there any reason why the Foreign Student Orientation program should mimic their hard-sell techniques and bureaucratic approach? The mythic, stereotyped America is well represented abroad. There is no good reason for reinforcing that myth during an orientation program here. The foreign student (and the United States) will be best served by an orientation program which shows him and prepares him for the truth.