

Not forgotten

The ASUO's proposal for a student-faculty governing board for Mac Court may have been tabled but it has not been forgotten, at least by the ASUO. They hope to revive the issue and bring it before the March general faculty meeting. This time the ASUO plans to concentrate more heavily on the political groundwork necessary to gain faculty support for the proposal.

Last week the proposal's day in court before the general faculty was extremely short-lived. The administration's objections to the proposal so over-shadowed the meeting that discussion was stifled. Pres. William Boyd's unprecedented move of relinquishing the chair to speak against the proposal brought the full weight of his office to bear on the faculty members present. When he spoke against the measure, his voice carried the authority of the president of the University and was not the voice of a faculty member. In addition, the opposition of Dave Frohnmayer, the University's attorney, raised the spectre of legal difficulties arising from the language of the proposal.

The ASUO was not even allowed to adequately respond to either Frohnmayer's or Pres. Boyd's opposition. In fact, Dave Donely, co-sponsor of the proposal, was not even allowed to speak. Donely's background and research into the history and operation of Mac Court was ignored and the faculty lost a prime source of information on the proposal.

The motion to table the proposal quickly followed the administration's vocal opposition to the plan and left some of the supporters feeling frustrated in their efforts to gain support and approval from the faculty members present. Donely characterized the meeting as a "farce." Don Chalmers, ASUO consultant, charged that the administration's comments "created... paranoia and fear in the faculty," and prevented "effective debate." ASUO Pres. Jim Bernau saw the motion to table as "a reaction to some very fine speaking."

Fortunately the ASUO has decided to tackle the issue again. The ASUO's decision to work at the grassroots level and contact individual faculty members that voted for the motion to table is a practical and effective tactic. By using this method the ASUO can answer questions and discuss the proposal's merits in a less intimidating setting.

The proposal deserves to be reconsidered and should be brought up at the March general faculty meeting. At this time, hopefully, both sides will be heard from fully and the ASUO allowed to refute the administration's rhetoric.

Letters

Drawing excludes

This letter is in reference to the drawing of "The Typical Oregon Student," found on page 4, section B of the Jan. 15th *Emerald*. This drawing of a guy in jeans and jacket seems to be in direct contradiction to a reply given to a student in the Jan. 14th *Emerald*, stating that the *Emerald* made an effort not to use sexist journalism.

However, not only is this drawing sexist, but it excludes the rest of us who don't fit into the role of the Youthful White American Male. (Of which there is a notable per cent represented at this campus.)

In the future, maybe the *Emerald* should try and practice what it preaches.

Nancy Neuenburg
and 24 co-signers

Editor's note: The drawing referred to is clearly labeled, "The Typical Oregon Student" and naturally excludes all who do not fit the definition of typical. The typical (majority) student at the UO is 18 to 25 years old, male, white and a US citizen.

Fill had

I cannot help but feel I am not alone in my complaint against the UO bookstore. After three and one-half years I have finally had my fill of the incompetent methods used in handling and ordering classroom texts.

After finally deciding on my class load for this term I took the dreaded trek to the bookstore. I was searching for books required in four of my classes. Since it was

the fourth day of classes, I was somewhat wary of my success at finding all of these gems. I never, however, expected to walk out empty-handed. It seems that between the professors who short-order and the bookstore, which refuses to order over an expected class load, we find ourselves confronted with an awkward and truly sad problem. Some might argue that I should have stood in those horrendous lines on Friday or purchased my books before registration. The obvious fact is that it makes no difference when you buy, someone is left out. I understand that many other bookstores catering to universities over order and give the student the benefit of the doubt; any books that are not used are then returned to the publisher at a minimal cost. I am sure that our bookstore has at least one reason why it continues their absurdly inadequate policies.

Unfortunately, I cannot present a solution to this problem at present, mainly because I have not totally researched all contributing factors. The problem, however, is there and it needs immediate attention. How can I possibly have a reasonable chance in my classes when I will not have a text until the third week?

John Billingsley
Sr., geography

Take a hike

We, the members of the Coalition against UFAB, hereby demand that the arrested members of the UFAB-supported demonstrators admit to their horrendous



'DEAR FIDEL: THE AMERICANS ARE GONE, I THINK. THE RUSSIANS ARE GOING TOO, I THINK. UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES ANGOLA IS MAYBE NO PLACE FOR A CUBAN, I THINK...'

crime of being obnoxious and immature. They should also apologize to the most honorable Dr. William Boyd, President of the University, in a letter of at least 283 words (to be proof-read by at least seven members of the English department).

We also demand that the story-time at the Day Care Center be shortened 20 minutes daily. Furthermore those who oppose tuition hikes should take up jogging or cross-country skiing.

We believe that the noise level at future demonstrations should be kept to 3.45 decibels (or less) so as that the other 15-plus thousand students here can get their money's worth in their classes. These demands are non-negotiable.

Greg Stiles,
The Only Member of
a Non-existent Group

Blame friends

When do "college pranks" cease and acts of vandalism begin? Being an RA in a freshmen dorm, I've had to ask myself this

question increasingly this term, even though it is only three weeks old.

During fall term in the dorms, you've consigned yourself to the fact that these pranks will run the gamut from penny doors, to shaving cream and vasoline on the door knobs. In most cases though, this mystique wears off by the end of fall term. This year we have been plagued by repeated "cuteness" on the part of the dorm residents to the point of jeopardizing the personal safety of all dorm residents. We have had repeated smoke bomb occurrences and, in one case, a Eugene fireman became ill. There seems to be an assortment of people who love to burn paper off the bulletin boards—not to mention the carpets. Last night our local bomb squad blew a hole in a toilet fixture to the tune of nearly one-hundred dollars.

Haven't we arrived at the point where we are no longer dealing in pranks, but in people's safety? People complain when their living costs rise—let them blame their friends for part of those costs. It is about time that everyone check

their priorities for being at school and save others some time and expense!

Peter B. Wagner
History

Exclusion felt

I am totally disillusioned with the women's rights movement. In this day and time of social equalization, it is shocking to find that an important sexist hallmark is left standing. Forthright sexism must either be eliminated totally or remain an American institution. The tempest of sexism I am referring to is the plaques on Gerlinger Hall which reads "Women's Memorial Hall." I feel that this excludes one-half of this University's population and thus should be changed to read "People's Memorial Hall." After all, if the women need to change our 100-year old school song so that it will not be sexist, why don't they strive to make the Gerlinger plaques non-sexist as well?

Steven Fogelson
Jr., Pol. Sc.

commentary

War games

A few weeks ago I attended a sporting event, the most common American exhaust pipe for the letting of mass aggression. Although I went to the arena with the intent of observing team sports, I found the attending crowd much more fascinating.

What began as a hearty ovation for the "home" team and a benign welcome for the contenders, culminated, at the end of the game, in one fan shouting, as an opponent writhed in pain on the floor, "I hope he is dead."

The gradual progression of crowd hostilities toward the challenging team and the "near-sighted" referees led me to conclude that observing competitive sports facilitates the manifestation of human aggression, especially in a mass setting. At this time I neither wish to assert that such events generate aggressive forces nor that they merely nurture latent tendencies, which, in the absence of these relatively controlled forums, would be vented in a more destructive fashion. A far more interesting social phenomenon presents itself--the phenomenon of social loyalty.

I observed that the overwhelming majority of the sporting aficionados supported the "home" team to the exclusion of the visitors. I asked myself: What possible quality do the members of this team share that the members of the other team lack? Are they more pious; more virtuous; more wise? Certainly not! Are they then stronger; more skilled; more agile? If these were the qualities which the fans admired the most, then they would root for the team with the best plays, the most points--the team that won the game. This, of course, was not the case. They invariably rooted for the "home" team, which incidentally, suc-

cumbed to the superior performance of the opposition.

Continuing this inquiry a bit further, I concluded that the only quality which all members of the "home" team shared was their affiliation with a particular educational institution. Thus, it was not the team which the crowd so vigorously supported, but the institution. It was not the belief in the superiority of the players which bred hostility, but the belief in an institution.

Again I inquired: What possible quality does this institution enjoy which the other institution does not? Does it provide a finer education; a broader cultural enrichment; a more nourishing social climate? Although I concluded that the institution failed in each of these three respects, I soon recognized the question as immaterial. Had this institution a superior educational, cultural and social environment, I could conclude nothing concerning the playing abilities of the "home" team, and, had I supported the team on this basis, I could have found myself in the illogical position of supporting a team consistently inferior in the arena.

Thus, the basis of support is reduced to physical proximity or personal allegiance, the historical determinants of one's political alliances. Historically these alliances were most violently expressed in political strife.

We observe the same phenomenon in the realm of sporting events. The institution becomes the state; the home team becomes the defenders of that state; and the game--cold, ruthless, savage war... "I hope he is dead."

Mark Evans
psychology, Sr.