

'No' to Boyd

University Pres. William Boyd has decided that students have no business in trying to determine or influence the quality of their education. In two recent decisions, Boyd had turned thumbs down to the idea of students having access to the information tabulated from faculty-course surveys and announced his opposition to a student proposal to include students on promotion and tenure committees.

The ASUO's struggle to extract information from the classroom survey dates back to last February. Along the way they were able to attract a considerable amount of support. On Sept. 24, the University Senate endorsed the idea of publishing these evaluations. On Oct. 28, ASUO Pres. Jim Bernau convinced the State Board of Higher Education's instruction committee to recommend to the full board that students be allowed access to the records. On Nov. 5, the General Faculty voted to support mandatory student-produced evaluation. Even Boyd concedes that publication of faculty-course evaluations is a "reasonable thing for students to do" provided that they do the evaluating and publishing on their own.

The State Board on Nov. 25 agreed that students should have access to evaluations but added a provision that the president of each state institution could decide if privacy rights would suffer from such disclosure. Boyd finally decided Tuesday and his response was a flat "no" to such access. His denial was not even based on whether privacy rights could be protected. He defended his decision on the grounds that the faculty in a Dec. 3 meeting voted not to make the surveys available for publication and interpreted this vote as a desire on the part of the faculty to deny students access to their own surveys.

Boyd's decision rests on very shaky grounds. The Dec. 3 vote was a response to a previous ASUO motion to adopt an entirely new mandatory evaluation system. In addition, the 150 faculty members that turned out for the meeting represent a minority of the University's faculty. This defense based on "faculty wishes" does not even consider whether privacy right could be safeguarded. The ASUO proposed that the results be extracted by authorized personnel. These extractions were not a blanket request for public access. In fact, did Boyd even consider consulting the faculty at large about their privacy rights, or did he assume that 150 faculty members represented the opinion of the entire faculty?

Not only has Boyd decided that students shouldn't have access to the surveys that they produced themselves, he is opposed to students having any voice in the faculty tenure and promotion system. He thinks, "The system would survive this added participation, but I don't think it will be improved by it." He adds, "The University is far too important to play with or make mistakes with." His assumptions are an insult to students' desires to intelligently influence their own educational environment. His decisions cast the student in a role of a passive consumer not even allowed to choose between inferior and superior products.

Boyd's actions on both of these matters, access to faculty evaluations and opposition to student input on tenure procedure, reflect a type of thinking that assigns students to the status of second-class citizens. We feel that these decisions were made not to help the University, but to thwart the power of an aggressive student body that desires a say about their education. We urge the president to reconsider and reflect on the implications of his decisions. These decisions definitely require more input from the entire University community and not just those closest to Johnson Hall.

Letters

Use opposed

I am writing this letter in response to the article in the *Emerald* on February 3 concerning the Athletic Commission meeting of Monday, February 2.

I think that a couple of things need to be cleared up. First of all I would like to explain the system used to determine the AD subsidy. As stated in the article, the Commission considered the subsidy figure of \$136,635.00. Under this system the above amount was computed on the basis of an even split. Half paid by the IFC (\$136,635.00) and half paid by the students who actually buy the tickets. The subsidy figure is down from last year by approximately

\$14,000 due to the decrease in the number of home football games.

Secondly, the article mentioned my suggestion of a possible \$1 charge to enter the lottery for tickets. This proposal was submitted with several important points left out by the writer of the article. The original proposal was to charge \$1 only to the students who actually received tickets and in turn funnel this extra revenue back into the IFC general fund. This proposal was intended to place more of the burden of expense on the students who actually use the service offered by the AD and relieve some of the pressure on the rest of the students who pay incidental fees. The proposal stems from the fact that we cannot reduce the

budget amount mentioned because of a State Board ruling limiting cuts of traditionally funded programs to 10 per cent. Due to this ruling it is impossible to reduce the budget further without AD approval or a vote by the students in which one third of the students vote and a simple majority of those voting approve further reduction. Both of which are in reality impossibilities.

As a member of the Commission I feel that it is my job to relieve some of the pressure from the students who pay incidental fees to subsidize the AD and receive no service for it. In essence I believe that the approximately 5,000 students who benefit from the program should bear more than half the cost. I am opposed to the use of IFC money paid by the entire student body to subsidize a program for the pleasure of a minority of the students, especially when programs which are necessary for some students to continue their education are suffering financially.

IFC funds come from your tuition. If you want a say in how it is spent I urge you to contact members of the Commission, the IFC or any ASUO officer.

Ken Wallace
Athletic Comm. Member

Half-truth

Regarding the recent opinion by the Angola Support Committee (*Emerald*, Feb. 4): The article presents a very incomplete picture of Angola. Their version of the truth, unfortunately, is only half of it and sadly narrow-minded.

The most obvious omission is the undisputed presence of 10,000 Cuban troops and 3,000 Katangese mercenaries from Zaire (tribal opponents of President Mobutu who is backing the FNLA) on the side of the MPLA. The Soviet Union has supplied over \$100 million in military aid to the MPLA. This does not, however, justify US involvement.

The Committee also omitted the fact that the Ovimbundu tribe, the ethnic make-up of the UNITA faction, is 40 per cent of the Angolan population. They are the largest faction involved in the conflict. A truly "popular" movement would hardly exclude them. To the people of Angola the war is not one of ideologies. It is not a question of what type of government; it is who controls the government. According to the Dec. 75-Jan. 76 issue of *Fight Back* (p.20) "Throughout Africa the new capitalist class that rules the USSR is trying to add to its growing economic empire, posing as a 'Big Brother' to the African people." The Angola Support Committee is apparently willing to replace the Portuguese with the

Soviets, leaving the Angolans still without their freedom.

The committee is correct to say that the US is involved to protect its economic interests. But the Committee must realize that supporting the USSR is silly for they are involved for exactly the same reasons, rhetorical ideological bullshit (from either side) notwithstanding.

The words of Tanzanian President Julius Nyerere are apt for the situation: "Freedom won for a people by outsiders is lost to those outsiders." The US and USSR should take the cue from the Chinese and leave Angola.

Mark Foster
Architecture

View challenged

I am writing in regard to Tad L. Hetu's letter about the slogan, "Science for the People, not for Profit" which was painted on the Science Library courtyard several weeks ago. His question, "How can science be for profit?" shows his ignorance. The pompous and belittling tone of his letter displays his closed-minded approach to a challenge to his world-view. Certainly science has resulted in great material gains and progress in our society—but one must never forget who controls the power science has generated.

I cannot see why we should "be far from a point of violent criticism of our society"—we are living in a society run by destructive and violent multinationals, who possess in huge measure the technology, but not the incentive (since it isn't profit-oriented) to improve the lives of everyone, not the statistically few who can be helped by the spectacular and laudable successes of much of modern science, such as the polymer organ replacements Tad lists.

Those multinational corporations used our scientific know-how to destroy Vietnam, defoliate it, change its weather, expose its people to toxins, napalm, pellet-bombs, automated battlefields and nightmarish tortures — all in the name of profiting from the raw materials of Southeast Asia's peoples.

At home, these corporations expose their workers to hitherto unthought-of hazards in the course of manufacturing polymers such as PVC or working with asbestos, radiation, chromates, heavy metals and coal tar volatiles. We, as consumers, are at their profit-oriented mercy as they develop insufficiently tested drugs, such as thalidomide or DES, which cause birth defects or cancer, as well as insidious preservatives, food additives and pesticides. Meanwhile, these industries are responsible for rais-

ing the level of pollution, which the World Health Organization estimates causes 75 per cent of cancers. Even the 1.5 billion (over five years) allotted to the "war on cancer" does nothing about the environmental conditions which cause cancer. Cleaning up pollution is not technologically beyond us, it is merely not profitable.

Here in Oregon, profit-motivated utilities seek to erect nuclear power plants which produce wastes which remain dangerous for tens of thousands of years. Forests which should be managed according to ecological principles are cut prematurely to save companies taxes or to sell as much as the market will bear.

Profiteering chemical companies dominate agriculture, developing pesticides despite the warnings of ecologists of their long-term dangers and pending ineffectiveness as insect pests grow less susceptible with each generation.

The Green Revolution, which Tad also mentions, is having effects unsuspected by the well-intentioned researchers who first began working on it. Typically the new grain varieties must have high fertilizer inputs in order to realize maximum yields, and commonly they must have some form of pest control (generally this is pesticides), since their lowered genetic variability increases their susceptibility to pests and diseases, and thus increases the possibility of catastrophic famine. Most of these needs are undeveloped or in short supply in most underdeveloped countries. They are expensive to purchase, and capital is usually in chronically short supply. There are other economic problems in the Green Revolution: Transport and storage are inadequate, and frequently responsible for great losses of food, especially to mold and rats. Often there is not sufficient "demand" for the food, since demand is purchasing power, and starving people may create no demand at all. Often the increased yield produces a grain glut on the local market, meaning lower prices. In such a case, the poor will be able to buy more food, but the farmer's incentive is destroyed, and the end result is often a lessened amount of food available or a government forced into price support programs that it cannot afford. Ann and Paul Ehrlich, in *Population, Resources, and Environment*, mention the case of Mexico, which supports the price of grain at double the world market value. Meanwhile people starve, due to economic juggling which interferes with the availability of a ready technology to fill the needs of all.

Anna Korn
Biology, Grad.