



RCYB respected

In response to a letter printed on Feb. 15: This letter questioned the black student involvement in demonstrations on South Africa. Apparently you haven't looked close enough.

The question is on oppression. We deal with oppression on a daily basis. Society and this University propose to satisfy us with limited gains. We are angered by this insult and angered by oppression and its support everywhere.

You are foolish to expect clear thinking people to put major decisions in the hand of business when the realm of business has proven itself to be concerned with money not people and human rights.

We do not support South Africa and its propaganda that U.S. corporations are providing opportunities for blacks in South Africa. The only thing they provide is an added element in the oppression.

I am not a member of the RCYB, but they are to be respected on the point of being active and doing what they can to change the horrific world situation for the better.

Lisa Hunter
Sophomore, Anthropology

Emerald erred

In regards to the editorial printed in the Feb. 14 Emerald, the facts are misleading. The editorial indicates an undergraduate would be barred "access" to the law library "to check out a point of law" or "do some independent study in law." The editorial is wrong. The memo clearly states the restriction does not apply to the "use of the library by law students and others engaged in legal study and in legal research and writing."

The Law School is a part of the University that is devoted to the study of law. The editorial makes the argument that because "it is operated by state funds...all students should have access." The statement is absurd. By the same reasoning, students should have access to study in the offices of PLC. Similar ridiculous but analagous statements can be made. The point is clear: certain areas of the University are designated for certain functions; the Law School is designated for the study of law...by anybody.

Mike Bloom
First year, Law

Letter inaccurate

The letter on appeals procedure for non-tenured faculty from the executive committee of the U. of O. Federation of Teachers that appeared in the Emerald recently (2-15-78) does not faithfully reflect the discussions on this issue that have taken place in the Advisory Council. The issue is more complex and the Provost's role far more helpful than is reflected in the letter. There do exist grievance procedures for non-tenured faculty when issues of discrimination or other violations of proper processes are involved. These appeals are covered in the administrative code.

However, very often such decisions involved difficult academic judgments about the teaching, research and service record of a

professor — issues that can be called substantive. On the one hand it seems fair that colleagues and students in the department involved have a major role in the difficult task of weighing such evidence. On the other hand departments behave most responsibly when there are clear avenues of appeal.

No one would want all of these cases to have to be decided by the Provost or President. However, it would not be good for small divisions of the University to be acting in an arbitrary manner. How can a system be designed that balances diverse goals? The Provost, together with the Advisory Council, has been trying to wrestle with these issues. Input from whatever source would certainly be welcome. From what I have observed of the Provost's methods and processes he appears to be trying to work through these large issues with care and consultation. I would not wish the community to get a different feeling from the tone of the letter published in the Emerald.

Michael Posner
Psychology Prof.

Follow procedures

As the nefarious "Dr. Love-Joy" of Dennis Moore's letter ("Frustrated," Emerald, February 10, 1978), I wish to reply to his concerns about not being able to register for a Writing 241 class. I sympathize with Mr. Moore's feelings, but wish to point out that the class had 25 people officially registered for it (a full class) at the time he tried to add it, which was after the deadline for registration for writing courses (the end of the second week) had passed.

If he had followed the suggestions given to him earlier for getting into the class he would probably be enrolled in the class today, as are several other students who were in his same boat and who did follow those suggestions. The way to register for classes is to go through the regular registration procedures in the department office, and not merely to sit in on the class until well into the term and then come in to the office to demand a place. Mr. Moore also neglected to mention in his letter that, to salve his feelings, I had offered him a guaranteed place in the course for next quarter.

Other villains in this piece are those students who register for a course and fill up the allotted spaces, and then neglect to drop the course until after it is too late for anyone else to add it. The only remedy I can suggest for this is to move the last day to drop back to the second week of classes, which would doubtless provoke cries of outrage from elsewhere against a heartless bureaucracy. We do the best we can for students. We expect them to do the same for themselves and for one another.

Glen Love
Acting Head, English

Angry Response

I write with considerable anger in response to the letter from members of the American Federation of Teachers' executive committee in Wednesday's Emerald.

They declare the absence of an appeals procedure for untenured faculty "even on grounds of discrimination or academic freedom," announce that members of the President's Advisory Council share their concern and "find deplorable, on the other hand, the Provost's position against the establishment of an appeals process in such cases."

One would think that before they took it on themselves to announce to the University a position of mine they would have the good sense, not to mention the courtesy, to find out if their description of the situation bore any resemblance to reality.

The facts of the matter are the following. The Council did express concern for the protection of untenured faculty who are terminated, and raised the question of an appeals procedure. I share that concern, and we discussed the matter at length at two successive Council meetings.

The Council feels strongly, and so do I, that protection on grounds of discrimination, academic freedom, etc., must of course be available to all faculty through appropriate grievance procedures. And I assured the Council that complaints on the grounds of procedural error by departments could be brought to my office, and I would undertake myself to guarantee the correction of any such procedural error.

What was left was the question of the judgment on substance (scholarship and teaching) involved in a decision not to reappoint. It seemed clear to me after some discussion, and I believe to all the members of the Council, that a formal appeals procedure here would be a mistake because of the enormous problems occasioned by having a committee outside a department attempt to reverse a department's negative judgment of academic quality. What we did decide jointly was to try to achieve the desired protection for the untenured faculty member against an arbitrary or capricious decision by requiring in every such case a letter to me from the department setting forth the decision, its basis, the expert advice and other confirming evidence that was used, and a roll call vote of the department (or possibly departmental personnel committee) on the matter. With the approval of the Council, I am writing a memorandum to this effect which will be presented to them and to the Council of Deans.

If the writers of the letter had indeed been primarily concerned with achieving their goal of fair treatment for untenured faculty, a goal which I strongly share, rather

than rushing into print as heroic defenders against a callous administration, one of them would have called me. It's easy to do. I answer my telephone, and if I'm busy at the time, I return calls. I would have been happy to explain what we were doing, argue for it, because I believe in it, and listen to their disagreements, if any. If we still disagreed, a public statement would then have been most appropriate.

Paul Olum
Vice President for
Academic Affairs and Provost

A word of thanks

I would like to thank the student body of the University of Oregon for their generous and enthusiastic support of "Seal Involvement Day" and the current "Save the Harp Seal" campaign. We raised almost \$2,000 from the activities on Involvement Day with the majority of this coming from student contributions. This money was given to Greenpeace Eugene and will be applied towards meeting the Eugene goal of \$5,000. This \$5,000 pledge will be sent to Greenpeace Foundation in Vancouver, B.C., and will specifically be used for producing a movie that will be aired on national television. Again, thank you for your support.

Jim Stratton
Survival Center

Bad assumptions

I think that Stuart Wilson (Daily Emerald, Feb. 15), took an awful lot on himself when he assumed that most of the students at the University agree with Joe Calhoun's (Daily Emerald, Feb. 8), ideas on the University and South Africa.

I am neither a member of the RCYB nor of the Southern African Liberation Support Committee. I'm not in agreement with the demonstrations and rallies that have been held in protest of the South African stocks. I am, however, appalled by what is occurring in South Africa. I believe that the Board should divest itself of the South Africa stocks.

This letter is to challenge the assumptions that the presence of U.S. corporations in South Africa are providing "all the people of South Africa more opportunities, with equal pay, for learning advanced technologies..." Are people aware that the average weekly

income for blacks is 4.5 pounds while for whites it is 60 pounds per week? By law, blacks may not hold skilled jobs — only unskilled jobs. Are people aware that, while the whites have the highest standard of living in the world, 7 out of 10 black families live below poverty level. How many people know what apartheid means?

I am sure that Mr. Wilson is not alone in his belief that American interests in South Africa are good for the blacks. These corporations are in direct support of the white South African government. This government deprives the blacks of the very opportunities that they should be allowed.

While divesting the stock will not directly change anything, it will provide one more weak link in the apartheid chain of power. I think that Mr. Wilson will find an awful lot of people on campus feel this way.

Mike Scott
Senior, Sociology

Ridiculous idea

I am writing in response to a letter, submitted by Dave Olmos, which appeared in the Emerald on Feb. 15. In the letter Dave stated that the varsity tennis teams should not be given priority on the tennis courts except for league matches. This idea is completely ridiculous. I wonder if he would ask Dick Harter to keep from scheduling practices when students want to use the basketball courts. Would he also ask to keep Bill Dellinger's track squad out of Hayward Field except for meets? I hardly think so. Both of these teams, as do other sports teams, are given priority on their playing surfaces for daily practices. Without practice, we would have no hope of producing respectably competitive teams.

Furthermore, with the non-funding of the so-called "minor sports" on this campus, tennis included, taking away the courts for practice would leave us with almost nothing. Think about it Dave.

Russ Childers
Sophomore, Mathematics
University Tennis Team

Letters policy

The Emerald will accept and try to print all letters and opinion columns containing fair comment on ideas and topics of concern or interest to the University community. Letters and opinions must be typewritten, using 65 character margins, and should be triple-spaced.

