

No state funds for sports

Friday, the State Board of Higher Education accepted a motion to request from Gov. Bob Straub permission to seek \$1 million from the Legislature to support college athletics. The board itself recognized problems with the plan, and while the safeguards they adopted met their objections, they don't meet ours.

The first major problem with the proposal is that it would, for the first time, have athletics competing with academics for funds at the Legislature. The board adopted a policy statement that athletic support not come out of the regular instruction budget, but it's fooling itself if it thinks the money would come from anywhere else.

Each legislative session, the efforts to control Higher Education's ever-increasing budget requests mount. Given this, it's foolish to assume the Legislature approaches education willing to spend whatever they're asked to.

Rather, each legislator has in mind an amount of money he or she is willing to spend on education and if a million dollars is spent in one place — say athletics — it's going to mean a million dollars won't be spent somewhere else — say library allocations. No policy statement adopted by the state board is going to change that.

But suppose the million dollars didn't come from some other area of education. Gov. Straub has already made it clear that the budget recommendations he has given to the Legislature commit as much of the state's resources as Straub is willing to spend. He says any addition in one place will cause dislocations in another and in an era when property taxes are climbing and people on fixed incomes are finding it hard to stay alive, scholarships for swimmers and long distance runners hardly seem to be urgent needs.

The other major problem with the proposal is that it takes away from students even the dubious control they have now over how much of their money is used to support athletics.

Currently, no major program can have its incidental fee allocation cut two years in a row, and no major budget can be cut by more than 10 per cent. The reasoning for these restrictions is that they allow for "an orderly withdrawal of funding."

Under the proposal accepted by the state board, student athletic contributions would be frozen at the current levels, and raised when the board deemed necessary. It's a dangerous plan. Why should the athletic department care what the students think of its programs when it knows the students have no power to withdraw their funding. Obviously there's no reason, and students would be forced to support the program whether they liked what was happening or not.

Athletic programs at many colleges are in trouble, but this plan is not the way to help them. We urge Gov. Straub to reject this proposal.

Leninism means imperialism

The anonymous author(s) of the recent article in the Emerald depicting V.I. Lenin as the guiding light of the working classes and of oppressed peoples have failed to grasp Lenin's real historical achievement. To put it simply: Lenin made the world safe for imperialism by creating a new ideological justification for it.

In the first place, Lenin did not make the Revolution, it was the Revolution that made Lenin. The "Russian" Revolution was in full swing before Lenin appeared on the scene; up to that point, he had been a minor socialist theoretician living in obscure exile in Switzerland. The Revolution was initiated by others. Had it not occurred at the opportune moment, Lenin would hardly be mentioned in histories of socialism. What he did was not to start a war against the Tsar, but to lead a coup against the already established provisional socialist revolutionary government.

In reference to the proletariat, one should ask why Lenin called out the Red Army to put down strikes by textile workers in Russia's central industrial region. More workers were shot and arrested by Lenin's order than during the entire Tsarist period. These workers (for example in Kolpino) were striking for unpaid wages earned in the factories newly nationalized by Lenin's government. Lenin created not a government of workers, but a government of an elite allegedly ruling for the workers (the "dictatorship of the proletariat").

Lenin's greatest achievement was adding to imperialism several new elements: a Marxist theoretical structure, modern mass terror with its technological expertise, and the technique of the Big Lie. His original support came not from the proletariat of Russia (which was extremely small in any case) as much as from the non-Russian peoples who made up almost 60 per cent of the population of the Russian empire. Lenin promised the non-Russians autonomy, freedom, and even the right to secede. It was they who formed the original nucleus of the Red Army, and it was other non-Russian national troops, and not the Red Army, who defeated the Whites, permitting Lenin to come to power. After securing his position, Lenin, the great arch-enemy of imperialism, turned the Red Army against the newly formed independent states of

the Baltic coast, Ukraine, Turkestan, the North Caucasus, the Transcaucasia. By this treachery, he was able to reconquer most of these territories by military force, often against fierce resistance, and to reorganize the Russian Empire under the name "Soviet Union."

Lenin justified his imperialist conquests simply by declaring that this was what these peoples wanted. The major problem with the justification was that it was obviously not true. Lenin solved that problem by using mass terror to suppress any expression of dissent, and by labeling all opponents of this new imperialism as feudal or capitalist reactionaries. He was thus able to restore imperialism in an increasingly ruthless and totalitarian form, while posing with righteous indignation as the great enemy of imperialism. To sum it up: Leninism is the highest stage of imperialism.

This same ideology, which for some strange reason many Western intellectuals have found appealing, permitted Lenin to establish the largest secret police and forced labor system (including numerous concentration camps) the world had ever seen, more extensive even than Hitler's Nazi system. Stalin had only to continue in the same path. The number of Soviet subjects imprisoned or killed in these camps is not in the thousands or hundred of thousands, but in the tens of millions.

When will people learn to judge a person not by what he says, but by what he does? All theoreticians and ideologies look good on paper. Judged by what they say, all power politicians are innocent of wrong doing — Nixon, Stalin, Mao, Hitler (who copied Lenin's Big Lie technique so successfully that he is often, but erroneously, credited with having invented it) or any other. Lenin's Big Lie method has been an evident success, and those duped by it — to their shame — include the anonymous authors of the Emerald's "staff column."

Acting Dept. Head—
Dept. of Religious Studies
Ronald Wixman
Dept. of Geography

students to file for candidacy before 5 p.m. Friday, Jan. 28, in Suite 4 of the EMU. We also urge all students in those departments to vote at the Information and Grievance Center in the EMU Main Lobby, Wednesday, Feb. 2 or Thursday, Feb. 3.

Andrea Gellatly
SUAB Chair
Jamie Burns
ASUO Vice-President

Theory misused

This is in response to the January 26th article concerning the implementation of behavior modification principles by L. Ross,

Associate Professor of Business Law.

We find this to be a flagrant and shocking misuse of Skinnerian theory which should not go unchallenged. The absurdity of using a behavioral point system in conjunction with the insidious application of a "normal curve" for grading purposes does little to enhance or further the effectiveness of a Skinnerian approach to education.

In addition, we feel that the retention of a curve system at any level of the educational hierarchy effectively undermines the individual's right to a successful and valid learning experience, and does nothing more than guarantee that particular slots will

be filled with the necessary numbers of failures.

We regret and deplore that administrators of institutions of higher learning continue to pressure the faculty into utilizing an immoral and antiquated method of determining success and failure. These are serious deficiencies to be considered regarding the problems facing the University structure and all individuals who come within its grasp. They will only be resolved when these individuals begin to re-examine their personal accountability in the furtherance of this dilemma.

Paul F. Bako
Graduate - Special Education
Paula M. Medaglia
Graduate - Special Education

Letters

SUAB slots open

Once every month a select group of 36 faculty and 18 students gets together to set University policies. All aspects of academic experience are affected by the decisions these folks make: curriculum evaluation, grading policy, add-drop deadlines, whether we have semesters or terms, the level of services offered to students. The 18 students are the elected members of the Student University Affairs Board. This week students majoring in sociology, music, English, librarianship, education, and undeclared can file for candidacy in the SUAB election being contested Wednesday and Thursday of this week. Four positions are open, yet only three students have filed.

SUAB is not just for aspiring politicians and old ASUO re-reads. It is made up of students from each department with the interest and energy to assess the needs of the students, come up with creative solutions to problems, and further the student voice in University policy. Within their constituencies SUAB members speak for students on specific departmental matters. As a third of the University Senate and members of the general faculty, SUAB members are influential in all major policy decisions of

the University. Service on the SUAB brings many benefits to the involved student: contact with faculty, administration and students, experience in policy making, and problem solving, \$45 a month, and the opportunity to affect the quality of every student's education. We urge all interested sociology, education, music, English, librarianship, or undeclared

WHO DO YOU LOVE?

I LOVE YOU

I DIDN'T ASK WHO YOU WORSHIPPED. I ASKED WHO YOU LOVED?

MARY RICHARDS, LORETTA HAGGERS, EDITH BUNKER, THE BIONIC WOMAN.

WHO IS YOUR HERO?

LAST YEAR BARETTA, THIS YEAR, DEL-VECCHIO BUT I ADMIRE SENATOR JORDACHE FOR HIS COMPASSION

WHO ARE YOU MOST AFRAID OF?

ERIC SEVAREID, BECAUSE HE DEPRISES ME.

WHO IS YOUR INSPIRATION?

KOTAK, BECAUSE HE'S A PSYCHOPATH WHO'S MADE IT A PLUS.

WHICH NEWS SHOW DO YOU THINK BEST REFLECTS THE TRUTH?

JOHNNY CARSON'S MONOLOGUES.

2-19 ©1977 JMS

OST FRED ARNSTADTER, WASHINGTON, 1977