

AD should show concern for students

"I don't give a damn about the contract."
—Assistant Athletic Director Mel Krause in
a conversation with IFC Chairer Jane Aiken

"We're all working toward the same goal."
—Athletic Director Norv Ritchey

Year after year, the University students have been paying for the negligence of the Athletic Department (AD).

But this year if the ASUO executive and the Incidental Fee Committee (IFC) stick to their guns, there is hope that the situation might change.

A close look at the situation during the past year reveals that the AD has been taking advantage of the students.

The AD contracted with the IFC last year to provide 4,000 student seats in Mac Court. Yet there never have been that many. A provision of the contract allows 200 athletes admitted without charge and the band (another 50 to 60 seats) to sit in the student section. The expected "no-show" rate for any one game was supposed to leave adequate room for everyone.

The 4,000 seats were calculated at a width of 15½ inches each. Recently, however, Eugene's fire marshal ruled that all seats must be 18½ inches wide. This means that there are only 3,775 seats instead of 4,000. Subtract from that the seats for the band and athletes and there are only 3,525 student seats for 4,000 ticket holders. (The fire marshal has a tacit understanding with the AD, however, that his ruling will not be enforced for the remainder of the season.)

With this kind of crowding is it any wonder that Mac Court crowds have been rowdy?

And that's not the whole problem. If any of the student tickets remain unsold, the AD may sell them to the general public at a cost of \$2.50 each. Of this money, the AD-IFC contract says that \$1.25 goes to the ASUO and \$1.25 to the AD.

Yet the AD's contract with the Pac-8 requires that 50 percent of the gate go to the Pac-8.

IFC Chairer Jane Aiken has said that Odell Wood, the AD's business manager told her that the AD would like to see \$1.25 go to the Pac-8, \$1.25 to the AD. That leaves nothing for the students. It also violates the contract.

When asked his intentions on this matter, AD Director Norv Ritchey told the *Emerald* "I couldn't comment on that yet; we're not that far into it." He did indicate a desire to work out an agreement with the IFC.

In other words, the AD would like to find some way of making the students pay for its failure to keep track of its business arrangements.

To add insult to injury, the AD oversold several games, despite the fact that the AD-IFC contract allows only the leftover student tickets to be sold to the general public.

The rationale behind this was that during Thanksgiving and Christmas vacations there would be a greater number of no shows. Since the games during those periods were not overly crowded, the strategy apparently worked.

The point, however, is that the AD had no way of knowing that it would. In effect, the AD risked an even more crowded student section so it could rake in more cash. On at least one occasion 600 to 700 extra tickets were sold. The risk of having to sit in a crowded student section was taken by students. Why should the AD profit from subjecting students to that risk?

The AD's insensitivity to students is demonstrated by another incident. Earlier in the season, the AD roped off part of the student section to provide seating for halftime entertainers other than the band of the visiting team. This meant even fewer student seats.

When the IFC objected to this, the ropes were removed, but the entertainers were still directed to sit in the student section when they entered Mac Court. Since Oregon athletes will provide halftime entertainment for the rest of the season, this should not be a problem any more. They already have 200 free seats.

The whole problem, according to Aiken, is that the AD is "trying to get more dollars for less service." If anybody has to pay for the AD's mistakes, students are the easiest group to hit. The AD has been doing a nice job of that.

There are several things which must be done to change this situation. The *Emerald* supports the following actions, most of which have been suggested by Aiken:

—The AD must be held to its signed contract. If it refuses to pay the \$1.25 per ticket which it owes the ASUO, the amount owed should be deducted either from the spring installment of this year's IFC allocation or from next year's. If this failed, then legal action would insure the AD's compliance.

—The IFC and ASUO should demand the revenue from the oversold tickets, again deducting the amount if the AD refuses.

—Next year's contract must assure a full 4,000 student seats.

—The new contract should not discriminate against most students by giving 200 free seats to athletes.

At the AD's budget hearing before the ASUO executive Monday night, a new approach to funding was revealed. The ASUO executive made clear that the money it gives to the AD is not to be considered as program support, but rather, as payment for an entertainment service.

The AD asked for \$165,000 a ten per cent "inflation" increase over last year's \$150,000 allocation. The ASUO, however, only intends to provide \$138,000—one-fourth of the normal season ticket price for 4,000 seats (or one-half of the normal student price).

One ASUO bureaucrat told the *Emerald* "If they buffalo us, then we'll recommend no funding at all." While such a move is unlikely because it would provoke a major fight with the administration, it remains a possibility. There is a strong undercurrent of support within the ASUO executive for cutting the AD off without a cent if it is unwilling to negotiate an equitable agreement.

Should colleges become havens for the elite?

By WILLIAM RASPBERRY

WASHINGTON — Americans aren't quite sure what to do about education in general, and higher education in particular.

One key reason for this uncertainty is that we are torn between two equally appealing but mutually exclusive notions. The first is that college is a reasonable means of training a leadership cadre. The second is a rejection of anything that smacks of elitism.

Instead of choosing between the two ideas, we pretend that it is possible to abide by both.

It's fine to look to the college trained for leadership, we tell ourselves, so long as we are careful not to deny certain elements of the population the opportunity for college training.

At the beginning, this means only that we shouldn't exclude exceptionally bright people solely because they come from families without wealth or status. Later, it means that people of ordinary means should be able to pursue higher education on the same basis as those of wealth — which is to say, anyone who wants to go to college

should have the right to go.

And finally, it means that all except society's cripples do in fact go to college.

This may be fine for the general educational level of the society, but it renders college worthless as a means for training a leadership cadre. Indeed, a college diploma is hardly more valuable today than a high school diploma was a generation or two ago when it comes to gaining access to the preferred jobs.

opinion

So now we look to the graduate and professional schools to produce our leaders. But not for long. It will soon dawn on us how hopelessly elitist it is to deny postgraduate training to all but a handful of college graduates. And when it does, we'll move to make grad school available to nearly everybody who wants it — which if it is to be the ticket to the good jobs, means nearly everybody.

Well, is it such a bad thing that so many

people go to college now, and will soon be going to graduate school?

The answer depends to a large degree on what happens in the universities. The trend isn't promising.

As long as only a few of us went to college, it was possible to make colleges a reasonably efficient way of developing the minds of those who were among the brightest and best to begin with. But send almost everyone to college and result, admitted or not, is the lowering of academic standards.

It may be that one reason college degrees aren't worth a lot more than high school diplomas used to be worth is that college students are not being taught that much more than high school students used to be taught. Maybe we're just stretching the same basic amount of education over more and more years.

That isn't universally true, of course. Some of the more prestigious and selective colleges have been able to cling to their high academic standards — at least for a while. But to look to those tough-minded schools for the greater share of our leadership is to fall once again into the trap of elitism: some colleges, and some college graduates, are worth more than others.

If history is any guide, the academically rigorous schools will yield to the pressure and begin accepting students (and graduating them) pretty much on the same basis as old State U.

Maybe all of this wouldn't matter very much, except that it is so enormously expensive. College tuition costs keep climbing until they will soon be out of reach for most of us. That, of course, would be one way of reducing college enrollments and rendering college diplomas meaningful again. But since that, too, is elitist, we'll probably opt for having the government pay for everybody's college and graduate education, which we'll all pay for later through inflation.

Universal college is costly in another way. It increases the number of incomeless years that most of us have to suffer through,

and for no useful purpose. That wouldn't be bad if people spent their time in college learning things they wanted to learn. In fact, most of us go to college in order to qualify for the kind of jobs we'd like to have.

Meanwhile, the emergence of the college diploma as the minimum qualification for useful work has had the effect of rendering high school almost totally useless, except as an entry requirement for college.

Sooner or later we're going to have to face up to the fact that equality of opportunity and inequality of results are not necessarily incompatible.

When we do, maybe we will be willing to open the entry door to college wide enough to give everyone a chance to try and at the same time keep the exit door small enough so that the whole thing is worth the effort.

(C) 1975, The Washington Post

Emerald letters policy

The *Emerald* will accept and try to print all letters containing fair comment on ideas and topics of concern or interest to the University community. Because of space limitations, letters must be no more than 250 words-typed, triple-spaced, dated and signed with the person's major or discipline. Longer letters will be shortened at the editor's discretion. Longer opinion columns will be published whenever possible after being submitted to the editorial page editor. The limit on opinion columns is 1,200 words, using the same format as letters.



THESE PEOPLE JUST DON'T UNDERSTAND MY DEEP CONCERN FOR THEIR WELFARE!