

editorial Faculty slapped

University Pres. William Boyd's dictatorial attitude toward running the University has spilled over from the area of student access to faculty-course surveys and student input to the tenure and promotion system and now directly threatens the faculty itself.

It is frightening that Boyd acts as if this is his personal University. Monday he opposed the idea of student input on the tenure process on the grounds that it reflects the "sandbox" philosophy. He reflects the same philosophy when he monopolizes the decision-making process: It's my ball and if you don't play by my rules, you can't play at all.

Boyd's latest assertion of his power deals the faculty a slap in the face. In a recent letter to ASUO Pres. Jim Bernau, Boyd reiterates his position of complete control over Mac Court. "...I need to remind you that the responsibility for McArthur Court rests with this office, not with the faculty. I have already indicated my unwillingness to create such a Board (student-faculty governance board), or to delegate authority to such a Board if it were created elsewhere. You cannot achieve your goal by any faculty action."

Measured against this type of attitude, Boyd's remark at his inauguration that the University is "an open society" has a very hollow ring.

Who does have access to Boyd? To whom does he pay attention? The answer lies off campus. Speaking engagements away from the University before such groups as the Portland Chamber of Commerce and civic organizations in Eugene draw his attention. Alumni also draw their share of his attention. They love him.

They approve of his style of running the campus. In the words of one alumnus, "Now, I think I can safely say that almost every alumn is behind Pres. Boyd—it's the way he maintains himself."

How does Boyd view the students that people his domain? Even before his recent stand against students directly participating in their University experience, he expressed his assessment of students before the Portland Chamber of Commerce. He finds it "reassuring" that they have changed. "Serious study has returned." Now that we are back to the books and off the streets, Boyd must find his job of leading us through his University easier. His assessment, however, may blow up in his face. During the late '60's and early '70's, students demanded more participation in their education. To varying degrees, these demands were met. These victories are not likely to be easily relinquished.

Boyd assumed office July 1, and most members of the University community adopted a wait-and-see attitude; a grace period. Within six weeks he chopped apart the Educational Opportunities Services (EOS) program and turned a deaf ear to those who objected. Even with this first warning, many, including the *Emerald*, were willing to give him the benefit of doubt. Six months is long enough. The honeymoon is over.

Letters

More snarls

Several points concerning my charge of discrimination (ODE Feb. 5) need clarification.

Bernau claims my application for the Title IX Task Force was lost due to "bureaucratic snarl," but this was not the only snarl. He reports only two persons applied before the "deadline." The announcement (ODE Jan. 23 and 26) contains no deadline. It stated, "One student is needed to serve on a task force that advises the President on the implementation of Title IX." Also, the *Register Guard* reported that there would be two student positions; and at least two memoranda from University Vice-President Hawk to Bernau clearly confirm this.

The *Emerald* reported that I said that Bernau's method for filling the vacancy, created when Darrell Murray resigned, violated Title IX. This is incorrect, and if I confused or inadvertently misled the reporter, I'm sorry. I said that according to affirmative action guidelines vacancies would have to be filled from the existing applicant pool (consisting of myself and two other female law students), or re-open applications for both positions. The applicant pool has been re-opened (ODE Feb. 5), but only for the vacated position. Incidentally, the advertisement did include a deadline.

When I was not appointed to the Athletic Director Search Committee last fall, I asked Bernau what criteria he used to select the students. He said that for the woman, he wanted an undergraduate who was very active in the women's

athletic program...; for the man, he wanted a graduate or undergraduate with no ties or pre-set opinion about the department. I told him this was a discriminatory double standard.

Had I been interviewed, as were other applicants, Bernau could have raised the issue of my "weak academic background" and I could have resolved his doubts. My record will disprove his claim. Finally, Bernau questions my motives, claiming I had not talked with him about my dissatisfaction. In a lengthy phone conversation, following the selection, we discussed my dissatisfaction with a) the process used, b) the results, and c) the adverse impact his decision could have on the future of Oregon athletics.

Students need strong, qualified advocates on the Title IX Task Force. I hope Bernau will correct the situation and appoint the two best qualified applicants.

Jane Aiken
first year law

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 200 words, typed triple-spaced, dated and signed with the person's major. No unsigned letters will be published. Longer opinion columns will be published whenever possible after being submitted to the editorial page editor. The limit on opinion columns is 800 words, using the same format as letters.



Duck Soup
Oregon Daily Emerald



Honestly, you people act as if this institution exists for your sake!

opinion

Join the boycott

Last Wednesday, January 28, more than 100 supporters of the United Farm Workers union rallied on the EMU Terrace, marched through the EMU cafeterias and picketed Johnson Hall as part of a continuing effort to get the University to keep scab lettuce off campus. We presented President Boyd with petitions containing more than 3100 signatures collected last term asking for the removal of Teamster-picked lettuce. We asked Boyd to at least let students decide what will be served in their cafeterias by putting the question to a vote in a binding referendum.

Boyd responded angrily, "I am a capitalist. I believe in the individual freedom of choice and individuals will decide whether they want to eat lettuce or not. I intend to have no vote on the issue whatsoever." Students will have to vote "with their mouths and stomachs," not in an election.

Boyd's position on serving Teamster-picked lettuce in the cafeterias is the same as Robert Clark's — he wants to keep it there. Two and one-half years ago Robert Clark said the University intended to buy only the best lettuce at the cheapest price regardless of who picked it. That is essentially the situation that exists today, despite the Clark-Boyd so-called "freedom of choice" policy.

The EMU Food Service does not provide students with a choice of lettuces. It purchases a certain number of cases, uses them up, and then orders more. Whatever is in the cooler goes into all of the salad bowls. Over a period of months, the bulk purchases of UFW and local as opposed to Teamster lettuce may even out, as the EMU claims. But that is not the question, is it?

In September President Boyd gave his word to the Eugene Friends of the Farm Workers that students would finally be given a clear choice in the cafeterias. He has not kept his word. Student cafeteria workers have never been properly instructed about preparing and labeling salads. At the grill the lettuce used for hamburgers comes from the distributor pre-shredded. So who in the EMU knows what kind it is? It is galling in any case to be told that we must vote with our mouths and stomachs. But this is particularly so when we aren't even offered a choice.

President Boyd says the farm worker question is a moral question for the University. By continuing EMU purchases of Teamster lettuce, Boyd claims he is protecting the right of individual free choice within this community. What he is actually doing is stripping us of our democratic rights and encouraging the exploitation of the farm workers.

The only place Boyd is willing to grant us our free choice is in the cafeteria lines. We can sign petitions but he will not listen. When we offer him a chance to publicly debate the issue with a UFW spokesman he refuses. When we demonstrate, Boyd has us arrested. He will not allow us to put the question to a vote. He has even banned the sale of food on campus by anyone other than the EMU Food Service and Gem Vending Company. Boyd's "vote with your mouths and stomachs"

morality has more to do with the assertion of the University's power than with any concern for the rights of individuals.

While the University serves its scab lettuce, farm workers in California are sweating and bleeding to build a union that will fight for their rights and give them a chance for a better life. Under federal law farm workers have no organizing rights and no protection. What limited rights they had in California for five months under the Agricultural Labor Relations Act disappeared last week when the State Senate refused to appropriate the money necessary to refund the law.

Farm workers have been boycotting head lettuce, table grapes, and Gallo wines since 1973 in an effort to win back contracts that were stolen from them by the Teamsters union. By purchasing scab lettuce, the University is supporting the union-busting tactics of the growers and the Teamsters and is directly adding to the exploitation of farm workers. Students here know that — that is why we have worked so hard to convince the University to join the boycott. That is our free choice, which we have expressed in so many ways. Why won't the University administration listen to us?

For nearly three years now the Eugene Friends of the Farm Workers and the UFW Solidarity Committee have been organizing student and community support for the farm workers. We have talked with people, shown films, brought in speakers, rallied, picketed and presented an art show. Our effort has always been to educate, never to seek out confrontations.

It is clear that our efforts have been successful despite official harassment. We have presented two University presidents with petitions containing over 3100 signatures. We have won a lopsided victory in an ASUO-sponsored referendum. We have had the support of numerous campus organizations and the student government, including the SAB, the EMU Board and the ASUO. We boycotted the EMU cafeteria for more than a year and took some \$80,000 in business away from it.

Why does the administration oppose us? We have asked President Boyd to discuss the question publicly, but so far he has refused. We have asked him to agree to a binding referendum and he refuses us that as well. Three thousand signatures on a petition and the clear support among students which they represent demand that he do both. A truly open society requires open discussion of all issues. A truly democratic society requires a democratic decision-making process. We challenge the University administration to openly discuss the farm worker question and to let us decide it democratically. Viva la causa!

Bill Ratteree for the
UFW Solidarity Committee

Kurt Willcox for the
Eugene Friends of the Farm Workers