

editorial

CLA out of bounds

Pres. Ford has announced plans to reorganize the nation's elaborate intelligence gathering apparatus. This attempt to curb and control the myriad agencies and departments that snoop into dark corners is long overdue but the chances of its success are not assured.

The pressure to reorganize came from a series of Congressional investigations into past and current intelligence operations. The investigations have their roots in the immediate post-Watergate era. The parade of Watergate figures who cited "national security" as a rationale for their illegal activities, helped to punch a hole in the notion that anything goes if it is in the national interest.

With this shibboleth discredited, Congressional committees began to unearth some of the more sinister intelligence operations; the attempted assassinations of foreign leaders and the domestic spying operations against private American citizens through electronic eavesdropping and mail openings.

Pres. Ford says that he will support legislation to prevent such activities and that he will place "overall policy directions for intelligence" in the National Security Council. In addition he revealed that he will create "a new independent Oversight Board to be made up of private citizens" to monitor these agencies.

Unfortunately, these agencies exhibit the tendency to grow and proliferate beyond their original bounds even more strongly than most bureaucracies. It is almost fashionable for government agencies not even involved in a foreign intelligence mission to have their own clandestine operations units. A prime example is the Internal Revenue Service's own intelligence section which snoops on taxpayers.

The re-shuffling of these organizations into a new hierarchical structure and the creation of new supervisory boards will be successful only if it is accompanied by a determination to protect our individual rights as citizens from the unwarranted violations they have suffered in the past. These agencies must be forced to adopt a passive intelligence gathering role and to abandon their current role of a clandestine arm of American foreign policy.

Letters

Complaint aired

Last spring, while serving as the Dormitory Governance Committee chairer, I had the misfortune to be interviewed by one of the *Emerald's* reporters. Several days later in an article appearing in the *Emerald*, on co-educational housing, I was flagrantly misquoted as having said, "Other than Mr. Barnhart I don't know any housing department people who aren't in favor of it (co-ed. housing)." I promptly complained at the office of the *Emerald* and was dubiously reassured they would follow up by sending the reporter who wrote the article to visit me. There was no follow-up. I was displeased at the unprofessional approach of the paper and enlightened at not only its haphazard reporting approach but at the lack for private concern the paper fostered. I considered the issue dropped and resorted to my own efforts to reconcile the matter.

This year the very same, word for word, misquote has appeared again in your paper. I cannot condone a paper misquoting and failing to follow up on the irresponsibility involved and I surely cannot understand and permit this outrage leveled at me once again. Unless your paper immediately makes it publicly known, within the confines of your pages, of both instances, I find no alternative short of legal action.

Michael A. Mitchell
Moore-Bean Complex

Editor's note: The Emerald has investigated Mr. Mitchell's complaint and has determined that the quote is accurate.

Page 4 Section A

Story qualified

I'd like to qualify a little bit some of the evaluations of polling techniques which were attributed to me in Les Mann's useful story in the *Emerald* last Friday.

The evaluations of such things as personal interviews vs. mail questionnaires were made on the assumption that the purpose of the poll was to project percentages to the total population — to be a kind of "mini-census," in other words.

Ironically, using polls to do a "mini-census" is the simplest and easiest purpose to grasp, but by far the most demanding purpose in terms of polling methodology.

Intellectually more demanding purposes — like hypothesis-testing, for example — can be satisfactorily achieved with somewhat less "perfect" methods.

Jim Lemert
Associate Professor
Journalism

Interests all

I want to compliment the library publically for the fine exhibit, now on display in the foyer of the library, on Adam Smith and the bicentenary of the "Wealth of Nations."

It is particularly enjoyable to me as an economist, but I am sure it will interest all who would like to know something about one of the most influential books ever written.

Barry N. Siegel
Economics Dept.



CIA INVOLVEMENT IN
[REDACTED], [REDACTED] AND
[REDACTED] HAS BEEN [REDACTED]
THROUGH [REDACTED] AND
[REDACTED] OR [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
NOW THAT IT'S OUT
IN THE OPEN LET US
GET ON WITH MORE
IMPORTANT MATTERS!

opinion

Union not government

Many references in newspaper stories refer to the ASUO as a "student government." Nothing could be further from the truth. We govern no one, but we do endeavor to represent student interests in the various decision-making arenas where student interests are many times the first to be sacrificed, and the last to be fulfilled.

The only aspect of the ASUO which students have direct decision-making authority is that of setting the level of incidental fees and then allocating those funds. Even here, the University President and State Board of Higher Education have the final word.

This situation is by no means confined to the UO or the State of Oregon, but is a fact of student life nationally. Incidentally, the ASUO has a reputation of a very progressive "student government" across the country.

The reasons for the progressive image of the ASUO are due in part to the relative power UO students have in levying incidental fees. The ASUO budget is currently over \$1.1 million and the students allocate every penny of it. Contrast this to the University of Washington where their budget (from student fees) exceeds \$3.6 million and they control only \$250,000 of it.

Another reason for the positive image of the ASUO and the other Oregon schools is because of the recent passage of HB 3043 granting "student governments" the right to bargain with the faculty unions and administration. There is only one other state in the nation with legislation granting students access to negotiations. Consequently, other student organizations are looking to Oregon to see the results of this "experiment."

Faculty of every public institution of higher education in the state have filed for unionization. Here at the UO we are already conducting research about the possible and probable effects of Faculty

Collective Bargaining on students. Your class size, professors' office hours, student participation in promotion and tenure decisions, tuition levels are all negotiable. The compelling interest for students is to at least maintain current levels of academic quality while attempting to increase it.

The likely consequences of Faculty Unionization is Student Unionization. Hence, the days of student governments are over, and the days of student unions or associations are just beginning.

One of the most progressive aspects of the ASUO is the newly created Student University Affairs Board (SUAB), an 18-member body which represents students by academic departments in the University Senate and General Faculty meetings. The SUAB members have the same status as faculty in these meetings with the right to introduce legislation, vote on motions, sit on committees, etc.

Much of the unrest prevalent in the sixties was due in part to the constant denial by faculty and administration of the concept of shared governance. That concept has now been translated into reality. Our predecessors would rejoice!

I have discarded the view that I am involved in "student government." Instead I perceive my colleagues and myself as representatives of a student union—your student union. Consider your incidental fees as "union dues" if you wish.

In any event the ASUO Executive exists for your benefit. If you have grievances, suggestions, or would like to be involved in university decision-making, please call or stop in Suite 4 of the EMU. That is what we are here for.

Kirby Garrett
ASUO Vice-President,
Chairer, Assoc. Oregon
Student Lobby

Hot air accepted

I have rarely seen an article with more misinformation than the one entitled "Hot Air" by Darlene Gore in the Feb. 2 *Emerald*.

I am one of what Miss Gore entitles the "small army of scientists" who are as she puts it trying to "milk" electricity from rocks. Her tactic of "tarring everyone by the same brush" as being minions of companies like Gulf Oil, Chevron Oil and Burbank Utilities is a cheap trick proven to be successful by the "Red Hunters" of the McCarthy era — but again is untrue. By far the largest number of this "army" works for governmental agencies and Oregon based firms.

The production of electricity from geothermal steam and hot water is well-developed and has been practiced successfully for over 70 years in Italy, 20 years in New Zealand (where it provides 10 per cent of the electric power for the country) and for 15 years in

northern California, where it provides a large share of the electricity used by San Francisco.

Geothermal energy is used for space heating and for process heating in many regions of the world. In Iceland the entire city of Reykjavik gets its energy for space heating from nearby hot water wells. In Hungary, France, Russia, Japan hundreds of apartment blocks are heated with natural hot waters. In Klamath Falls, Oregon, approximately one and a half million gallons of oil are saved annually by using geothermal heat. Oregon taxpayers are saved a quarter of a million dollars a year because the president of OIT was far-sighted enough to develop geothermal heating at that college.

There are many good sources of information on geothermal power in Oregon and in Eugene. Hot air, like Miss Gore is venting in this article is exactly as she says — hot air.

Journalism has reached a sad

state when the facts get as twisted as in this article, and by the acceptance of such hot air by the *Emerald*.

Richard G. Bowen
Portland, Oregon

Editors note

In Leslie Zaitz's column Tuesday, he reported that Richard Eymann, Oregon head of the Jimmy Carter for President campaign, hadn't found any students to work on the campus part of the campaign. Since Zaitz originally researched the article, a Jimmy Carter organization has been formed on campus. The campus organization, launched Thursday, is headed by Bryan Cohen. Students interested in working on the campaign can call Cohen at 686-6147.

Thursday, February 19, 1976