

Editors note: The following article is the first of a three part series on the expenditure of incidental fee money on athletics in the University.

Last year 20 per cent of the ASUO incidental fee budget was spent on sports programs, supposedly for the benefit of students. Where this money is spent should be of vital

By IAIN MORE  
For the Emerald

interest. Unfortunately, not enough students have critically analyzed what their money was being spent for, and as a result, practices and policies that do not reflect the students' interests have been implemented and continued without being challenged. The purpose of this series is to begin the examination necessary to thoughtful judgment on the expenditure of so much of the students funds.

There are five main sports programs at the University: The Athletic Department, the Club Sports Program, the Womens Recreation Association, the Intermural Program and the Outdoor Program. An evaluation of these programs and their level of funding will show the sorts of imbalances that exist, and what kinds of alternatives there are for correcting them.

The Athletic Department at the present time takes approximately 86 per cent of the \$257,000 that the ASUO gives to the five campus sports programs. This year, the Athletic Department is requesting what amounts to an eighty per cent increase over the \$211,000 they received last year, for a grand total budget request of \$375,000. No other sports program has made such a request for increased funding in years.

## Athletics . . .

### What are we always paying money for?

It is not difficult to understand the reasons behind the request. The costs of intercollegiate athletics has increased in the nation by more than 100 per cent over the past ten years.

And, while costs are going up and up, a Gallup Poll taken in this year shows a serious decline in interest in such programs.

Of the students surveyed, 43 per cent felt that student concern over intercollegiate athletics was definitely on the wane. More important than these figures is the fact that while during the past twenty years student enrollment in colleges and universities has increased more than eighty per cent, there has been only an eighteen per cent increase in collegiate football attendance.

For example, in 1948, 83 per cent of the undergraduates at the University of Southern California attended football games, but by 1962, only 51 per cent did so.

An indication of the things to come in the use of student fee money for support of intercollegiate athletics came this year at the University of California at Berkeley. The students cut off the compulsory fee to the athletic department there, and

reallocated the \$310,000 total "in a manner more broadly representative of student needs."

And the winds of change are blowing nationwide. The University of Buffalo has recently dropped its football program because of the heavy expense and a growing lack of student interest. The Universities of Chicago and Denver have dropped intercollegiate athletics altogether. The clearest sign for the future is the consistent trend on new campuses to not even begin intercollegiate programs.

But if attendance is down while costs are up, and schools are either dropping or refusing to start such programs because they serve less and less the serious needs of students, why is it that so many athletic departments are still in operation? The answer is that in one important sense, athletics at the college level is a big business. And students have for years been stockholders in the firm, although they don't often get a voice in the direction the business is taking.

The University's Athletic Department is a clear example of this relationship. The students, through their contributions in in-

cidental fees, are major stock holders. And as this is the case, it is interesting to examine the department on a cost-benefit basis.

In the first place, the students have for years been the consistent suppliers of new capital for what is a speculative venture. The amount of money the department receives from alumni donors fluctuates widely from year to year. In 1965-66, alumni contributed \$85,000. In 1967-68, it went up to \$145,000, and dropped last year to \$130,000. Student support on the other hand, has increased every year from 1964 when the investment was \$162,000, to 1969-70 when the students chipped in \$258,000.

Thus, the important question of the return on the students' large investment should be an important one—what have we gotten? This is certainly difficult to evaluate, but it is clear that students have not come away the big winners. Those who really gain are the highly paid professional players, for whom the students maintain a farm club system, the general public, which demands this sort of entertainment, and the television networks, which make large profits selling commercials sandwiched in between plays.

And if this is the case, why do the students continue to make increased contributions of capital to the Athletic Department?

The answer, in the main, is the fact that students have little or no control over how the Athletic Department spends its money, and the goals the Athletic Department is trying to reach.

Tomorrow: The Athletic Department and the NCAA, Autzen Stadium, and alternative methods of funding.

# OREGON DAILY emerald

Vol. LXXII, No. 130

University of Oregon

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

## Penn mentor to replace Belko as basketball coach

Steve Belko, the University's durable and sometimes controversial basketball coach has announced his retirement from coaching.

University Athletic Director Norv Ritchey said Tuesday that Belko will step down as head basketball coach to assume duties as an assistant athletic director at the University.

Dick Harter, head coach at the University of Pennsylvania, and rated one of the top young coaches in the country, was named to succeed Belko late Tuesday afternoon.

Harter has coached for six years, five at Penn, and owns a 104-53 overall record. His last two teams have sustained 25-2 and 28-1 records, were Ivy League champions, and NCAA regional finalists.

Belko, who has been coaching for 21 years, 15 at Oregon, owns a 179-211 record at the University, including two teams which he took to the NCAA playoffs (1959-60 and 1960-61).

His teams have posted identical 17-9 records the last two years, finishing third and fourth respectively in the rugged Pac-8 conference.

Belko, serving as first vice-president of the National Basketball Coaches Association, is currently attending the convention of that group in Springfield, Mass., and was unavailable for comment.

Harter will be bringing two of his assistant coaches at Penn with him. Dick Stewart and Ray Edelman apparently will both hold assistant coaching positions at the University.

Harter's appointment and the inclusion of two assistant coaches in the package brought im-

mediate comment from ASUO president Ron Eachus.

"This is exactly the way students get trapped into continually funding the Athletic Department at a disproportionate level with other departments," Eachus said. "At the same time we are asked to set guidelines for change and make consistent contracts, they (the Athletic Department) make contracts increasing their staff and commitments without consulting us."

"The increases are obvious; at least there's an increase of one staff member with keeping Belko and hiring a new coach—that means an additional staff salary. If we find out that the new coach is getting a greater salary and he's bringing in other assistants, that means far greater increases."

Contacted at his home Tuesday night, Athletic Director Ritchey expressed surprise at Eachus' charges.

"I would like to express surprise and dismay at Ron's statements. I've constantly emphasized that the prime reason that we as an athletic department, and inter-collegiate athletics, exist, is for the benefit of all students and the general University community."

While Ritchey declined to discuss specific provisions in the department budget which would allow for new hirings, he did indicate full disclosure would be made next week when the athletic department's budget goes before the ASUO Fiscal Committee for a complete hearing.

See related stories on page 14.



Dick Harter



Steve Belko

## Student union slates peace week activities

By NAN HENDERSON  
Of the Emerald

Plans for a "massive peace rally involving as many anti-war groups as possible" were finalized at a Tuesday night meeting of the Student Union.

The rally is scheduled for Friday, April 23 at 8 p.m. in 138 Commonwealth. A dance on 13th Ave. will follow the rally.

"The purpose of the rally is to explain the strategy for all of the spring anti-war activities, especially those revolving around May Day and in support of the People's Peace Treaty," explained Steve Thomasburger, one of the rally co-ordinators. "We hope that at least 500 people will attend," he added.

Continued on Page 5