

ASUO

Iain More looks at the year

News of student government

This year, 1971-72, students have been involved in decision making within the University from the Advisory Council level through the Budget Committee, HPUP and the departments. It has seen a student position created on the State Educational Coordinating Council, on the Finance Committee of the State Board of Higher Education and, nearly, on the Board itself.

Yet within the University itself, the progress is only a beginning. The general faculty meeting as a method of decision making in this institution is unwieldy and, in pure American, undemocratic. Students have suffered at the hands of a reactionary faculty (e.g., the University Personnel Committees and the University Conduct Code) in a year when they themselves have been the most progressive. The Faculty were in general slow to react to records policy, slow to react to HPUP. They grumble at Johnson Hall while it is their own guild-like composition and preoccupation with participatory democracy which gives Johnson Hall its power.

Just a university

My own country, Scotland, has a new university. It isn't a student university or a faculty university; it is just a university. All areas in the university are for faculty and students. University decisions are

made by administrators, faculty, students and community people. I don't want Oregon to have a student union, a faculty senate, a faculty meeting. I want it to have a University union and a University senate. The substantial decisions of education cannot be decided entirely by the recipients, but they should have a major say.

Persistent student representation at the State Board has not always been effective but it has made its presence felt, particularly with success in regard to tuition raises, to student interests in the transfer of Straub Hall and to dormitory rates.

At the Legislative level, student control of the incidental fee for at least two years was saved when extinction seemed imminent. More importantly, students successfully lobbied for higher education during the special session in November last year. There is no doubt that the credibility of students at the legislature was way ahead of any other constituent of higher education and went a long way to avoid the threatened \$2 million cut and raise in tuition.

ASUO not much better

If the University is a vast bureaucratic organization which is having to financially overdigest itself at this time, the ASUO is not much better. The changeover in

Athletic Department funding which ironically met the still undecided wrath of the Office of Emergency Preparedness (Phase I of the Wage and Price Freeze), certainly opened the way for new priorities. However, the whole ASUO needs evaluating. A start was made with the absorption of a number of outlying budgets by the ASUO Executive. At least expenditures can be observed, purposes better scrutinized and communication improved.

This began this year. It needs a lot more work. The incidental fee will be \$17.50 per quarter in 1972-73, a reduction from 1971-72 and the lowest in the state. That isn't the answer though—we need to look at our priorities, too.

The problem is that most students don't know what the ASUO does or how it does it. I have outlined a bunch of things we have done. We've also provided free legal services, an expanded SEARCH program and now have working drawings for a tavern in the EMU. If it's built and you drink there, incidental fees will go down because the EMU income will increase.

People still oppressed

The rest of the world isn't much better than a year ago. People are still oppressed because of where they were born or who they are born to. The war still goes on. The

International Symposiums should have let you know that America is not only doing it to herself.

I believe that morality cannot be changed by legislation or war, nor can the world. I hope it can be changed by education. But we have to change education and that will be hard. We still resist change better than we fight for it. My own school of Health, Physical Education and Recreation is an example. The loss of the physical education requirement, given a little cushion of funds, would have forced the department into much needed innovation—not so much in its service courses, but in its professional program. However, recent reports and even the disbursement of Federal monies give some hope for innovation and experimentation in higher education.

We have tried to make a certain sort of impact here this year. If that method doesn't change things, if this year's elections bear the same fruit as 1968, then maybe there is only one answer. People already have compared this year's ASUO to last year's. Some think we have succeeded where Ron Eachus didn't. We might appear to have. We might appear to have better ideas, better methods. Ideas and methods that give success. I don't think so. Last year was the biggest part of this year. 1972 has been built on the back of 1970-71.



Out-going ASUO President Iain More.

'We are opposed to the war . . .'

Note: The following statement was issued jointly by ASUO President Iain More and University President Robert Clark on May 3.

This is a statement of our personal conviction which is not based on any greater knowledge than that of the average person who reads a little, listens a little, and draws such tentative conclusions as he can defend among average citizens.

We are opposed to the war, opposed to the present escalation. We urge the President of the United States and Congress to withdraw all United States forces immediately upon the insurance of the exchange of prisoners of war and a process of free elections to determine the political leadership in Vietnam.

As one means of accelerating

this process and thus aiding humanity and also asserting the rights granted by the United States Constitution, we support the efforts of students and faculty on May 4th to debate and to educate their fellows and the people of this community; to petition and to canvass for candidates supportive of their position and to commemorate the loss of lives in the war. We do not support violence or coercion. Violence and coercive tactics have failed in Vietnam and they will fail here also.

We make this joint statement—one as a citizen of the United States looking at his own country's role, one not a citizen looking at the United States in a world role, yet both with a common goal—to end this war and to endorse constitutionally supported activities which will help achieve this goal.



University President Robert Clark