

A chance to get together

The ASUO Senate must soon deal with the hot-potato question of its own abolition. The body has ceased to be a viable student legislative assembly and should be replaced as soon as possible with something more workable.

It is entirely possible the general faculty meeting will deal with a similar question sometime in the near future. Faculty meetings are viewed with sacred-cow respect at the University. Ideally all faculty members have their say in University governance through regular monthly meetings.

Analogies between ASUO Senate and monthly faculty meetings are difficult. But both bodies, despite their different design

and purpose, are losing credibility for similar reasons.

Attendance at faculty meetings has been dropping steadily. The bulk of legislative work is done by the Faculty Senate, a more exclusive and definitely more manageable institution.

The ASUO Senate has also lost credibility as its membership has become concerned more with image than substance. The real work of the ASUO is done by a few senators.

It would be easy for both faculty and students to work independently at creating new representative institutions.

In fact remarks at Wednesday's Faculty Senate meeting indicated changes

from that direction will involve little or no student input.

And efforts to revise the ASUO Senate have not as yet addressed the issue of combined student-faculty representation.

The Emerald feels current dissatisfaction with representative institutions presents an ideal chance for students and faculty to get together.

Why shouldn't University governance be a shared student-faculty function?

Why not replace faculty meetings, the Faculty Senate and the ASUO Senate with a University Senate?

If such a metamorphosis is going to occur it should occur now when all factions seem to be dissatisfied with the status quo.

Letters

High Prices

It's too bad that an "old-fashioned" play like *Oklahoma* doesn't have the same kind of admission fee. Perhaps it's because I'm from the state of Washington that I have never seen or paid such outrageous charges.

I was always under the assumption that when the University sponsored a play, it was for the students first. Apparently, this is a misconception.

I know few students who can shell-out \$2.50 and \$3.50 for a ticket to anything. I can only hope the Eugene community will support the production because most of the students that are going are in it.

Jack E. Thomas

Fair Compromise

Bravo for Bill Wyatt and whoever else may be responsible for the S.B. 47 amendment proposal. I, for one, have no awareness of why all students should have to patronize our excellent athletes. The spectator sports folks who like to watch them should be doing that.

I'd rather see more of the budget helping support nurseries for the children of needy students. Or maybe more free movies and concerts. Another nice idea might be to give some of the money back to students when they voted, so every student would have a chance to say how some of it gets spent.

\$900,000 will pay for a lot of trips, if we're careful we could do almost anything. If the amendment is in fact enacted, it really will be interesting to see if we can handle all that power. Will we discover we are in fact the "Diversity" of Oregon?

Whatever each of us may be into, I only hope we possess the wisdom and tolerance to want a fair compromise more than anything else.

Gregory G. Howard
Geography

Leave precision

Thanks to the Emerald for that rarity of rarities, a literate review: I refer to Regina O'Neil on *Molly Bloom*, the Joycean soliloquy adapted by Randi Douglas into a one-act play, and performed at Scarborough Faire. O'Neil clearly has read *Ulysses*, whence cometh *Molly*, plus Wm. James and I don't know who-all else on the subjects of consciousness and literature.

But therein lies her weakness: so great is O'Neil's love and respect for Joyce's novel that despite Randi's virtuoso acting, despite the tightness of the production, despite the clear-cut enjoyment of the play by the audience—despite all these, she presumes to criticize Randi's adaptation on the preposterous grounds that it is not, in fact, *Ulysses* itself.

O'Neil might better have compared *Molly* with Joyce's sole extant play, *Exiles*. *Exiles* was a flop in every sense—dull, unplayable, boring even as literature. To Joyce, the failure of *Exiles* was a blow—and his belief that the dramatic is the highest form of literature, besting the Oregon Daily Emerald

forms "lyric" and "epic", makes clear that while he respected drama, he knew not how to produce it.

What Joyce needed was an editor, as Randi Douglas has remarked, someone to focus Joyce's encyclopedic energies, to impose what O'Neil calls "temporal coherence, a reasonable sequence" on the chaos of *Ulysses*.

I am, then, making the preposterous claim that Randi's adaptation does not narrow, but rather focusses, the energy of *Ulysses*, which is after all, a simple comic piece, whatever its epic pretensions. For me, *Molly* is larger than *Ulysses*, in that it heightens the drama that Joyce felt, wanted, sweated after, but failed to produce. *Ulysses* is about as dramatic as a biology book—in fact, *Ulysses* is a biology book. *Molly* is a PLAY: dramatic, human, actable. The problem is more challenging.

O'Neil hits her peak in describing Randi the actress, and in comprehending that Joyce's *Ulysses* cannot have been other than a man's view of woman. She ought to have further grasped that to stage the soliloquy as Joyce wrote it would have been as foolish as to film *Lady Sings the Blues* complete with three husbands, dubbed-on soundtrack, the narks at Billie's deathbed . . . let us leave precision to Volkswagen and Xerox, dramatic adaptation to Randi Douglas.

Eric Park
GTF, English

More than duty

Some people think that they have to criticize the actions of the Nixon Administration simply on basis of their presumption that that man can not do

anything good anyway. I hope, that your editor does not belong to that category.

Although I also had very serious doubts about some of the actions of this administration with regard to a settlement of the conflict in South East Asia, I thank God that at least an end did come to the war in Vietnam. Now, after the cease-fire agreement has been signed, it is not more than the administration's duty toward the families of the POW's, MIA's and deaths to get all the information possible about their fate.

You agree.

We also agree that there is no reason to believe that Hanoi is deliberately holding back its lists. For me this does not mean though that the Pentagon just has to 'wait and see' what is going to happen. For there is also no reason to believe that Hanoi does not make mistakes like the Pentagon did. Also, your editor could know that efforts to get a full accounting of the POW's, MIA's and deaths are given on a low diplomatic level just in order to prevent, I assume, that they can be considered an 'emotional attack'. Or did the national press inform me wrong?

Albert Wesselink
555 E. 14th apt. 1
Eugene, Oregon 97401

Misconceptions

The misconceptions of the "middle-aged Portland housewife" concerning the Equal Rights Amendment (as reported in the Emerald today) are unfortunately all too widespread. Perhaps some replies will set the record straight:

1. The ERA will of course make women

equally eligible for the draft. But if I had an 18 year old son (which I don't) I wouldn't want him to be drafted and "sent into combat to run the risk of mutilation and capture" any more than I want my daughters (which I do have) to be drafted. (Assuming the draft will even be revived in the future.)

2. The ERA will have no effect on women's—or men's—right to privacy. It specifies "equality" of treatment, not "identity." And while separate schools for blacks and whites were held to be inherently unequal as expressing a notion of superior-inferior races, no one is seriously suggesting that the separation of bathrooms for men and women has such sociological implications.

3. The ERA will not turn sex criminals loose on the public—rather it will extend to men the same protection rape laws now supposedly give women.

4. Neither will the ERA strip women of protective labor legislation. Rather it will force legislatures to decide that if working conditions are to be safe and healthy, they are to be safe and healthy for all employees, not just a "favored" class.

5. The ERA will not destroy a husband's obligation to support his family. As a matter of fact it will have no effect in this area on Oregon law, under which already both husband and wife are jointly responsible for support and care of their family. (Oregon Revised Statutes 108.040)

Hopefully this will help to do away with some of the more prevalent "horror stories" circulating about the Equal Rights Amendment.

Gretchen Morris
3rd year, Law



'I LIKED IT BETTER WHEN WE COULD SIT AT HOME AND CRITICIZE THE BUNGLING AMERICANS!'