

opinion

AD ticket sales should change

Lotteries, like bingo parties and the mumps, usually suggest an element of chance. But virtually everyone who participated in last week's athletic ticket lottery had the opportunity to win.

Even after the lottery had run its course, the athletic department had 450 student passes left unsold. And it took the rest of the week for the department to unload them.

We don't know what caused the decline in ticket demand, but see the change as an opportunity for the ASUO and the University to scrap a system that never worked well anyway.

With the lottery, 16,000 students subsidize a system from which only 4,000 students can possibly

OURS

benefit. Of the 4,000 student passes distributed, an unknown number are sold for up to \$60 profit to those who have the right mix of money and mania.

A fairer system would be to sell the tickets on an individual-game basis rather than by the season.

The athletic department could divide the total tickets available for student sales by the number of applicants. Individual tickets for particular games might be sold and traded, but at least every student would have a dozen or so chances to scramble up to the fourth balcony, get dizzy and turn a little crazy.

Unused and returned tickets could be sold only to students at a general admission price the day of the game.

YOURS

GTFs need their union

Repeatedly during the past few weeks, I have been confronted with one rather-strange reaction to the GTFF negotiation impasse. This is the opinion that, though the GTFs "deserve" a fair contract, they should not use the strength of a union to get it.

These people have not denied the justice of the demands of the GTFF, they have simply objected to organized labor in principle.

This is an idea that could only be taken seriously in an isolated academic fairyland, far removed from the world of wages and profits. It is an idea that only makes sense in a world in which employers never try to take advantage of workers and workers never have to band together to fight such exploitation.

Obviously, the world we live in is not such a world.

I can see no other way one could rationally object to organized labor in principle. One can dislike one union or another for some reason, but this has no bearing on the GTFF unless one wants to accuse them specifically. I have heard no such accusations, because there are none to be made.

The GTFs need the GTFF to get that fair contract. I urge all students to support them in their efforts.

Scott Meyers
Sophomore, Linguistics

Support GTFF struggle

The University's failure to bargain in good faith has forced the Graduate Teaching Fellows to prepare to strike. They have been used as a cheap source of labor: Their wages are at the pre-1969 level due to the rise in cost of living, and they work 20 hours for 6 hours of pay.

Many students may be afraid that if GTFs get a salary increase, the University will retaliate by increasing tuition costs. The University has never been able to use the GTFs as an excuse when raising our tuition — while our tuition goes up, GTF salaries remain at a substandard level. We should remember, too, that GTFs have supported us in the past in our efforts against tuition increases.

Their struggle today over decent working conditions and wages is not just one of them looking out for their own self-interests, but is to ensure that there is a strong union to represent future GTFs as well. Some of us may become GTFs one day. How would we like to be overworked and underpaid? This could happen unless we force the University to change its present refusal to agree to a fair settlement.

In fact, the University is prepared to use scabs to teach GTF classes should they strike. We should protest this so they don't get away with it. Let's get out to the pre-strike vote rally today at 12:30 in the EMU Breezeway.



greg wasson

tabled indefinitely

You got your ol' boy Jesus hanging up on the cross in Galilee looking down on all those damn Romans and he was thinking up to heaven.

As Jeffrey Frederick, songwriter and front man for the Clamtones, tells it, Jesus was confused. He felt forsaken and couldn't understand why his Father had forgotten him. Sudeenly the clouds rolled back and he was enlightened.

Tell 'em all their sins will be in good shape if they crucify you.

A heavy decision.

Is the good of some faceless mass more important than an individual's suffering? Jesus thought so and has been the role-model for all martyrs since. Self-sacrifice is a recurring thread in Western thought and Jesus made the supreme sacrifice: He gave his life that you and I might bridge the gap between this world and God's.

But is self-sacrifice necessary?

Maybe it's my youth, general optimism or sheltered life, but I don't think so. People are basically good and hardly needed for someone to be tortured on the cross that the world might be a pleasant place. But the self-sacrificial concept's still strong. People often assume unasked burdens and make self-denials no one expects.

At this point, it may be germane to recall an important word of the late '60s: communication. Communica-

tion is a must for interpersonal goings-on. One shouldn't storm ahead ignoring signals from others. On the other hand, we can reasonably expect those signals to be loud enough to be comprehensible.

Communication relates to self-sacrifice in that knowledge helps set a realistic living style. Knowing what others expect keeps us from continuing when additional efforts are unnecessary. Don't turn down the stereo because your roommate might think it's too loud. Expect him or her to tell you if it is. It's not selfish to boost the power if you've never had the intolerable volume level identified.

Too often people hold themselves back in fear of going beyond some accepted limit. One can't be expected to know what all those limits are and it's fair to assume people will speak up when they feel infringed upon. Your responsibility is to listen to them and pay attention to their needs.

Limits breed resentment and cramp one's style. Unneeded limits produce senseless restrictions. The emphasis should be on allowing as much room for action as possible.

As the Clamtones would sing:
*Take these nails outa my hands;
I swear you'll get to the promised land
All your sins are forgiven; now let me down.*

theirs



This act of solidarity on our part now for the GTFs will be an assurance that we'll get their support the next time the University wants to raise our tuition.

Colette Postol
Junior, Sociology

Union value overlooked

In reference to Douglas Zuercher's (the pseudo-architecture major) letter concerning organized labor, we'd like to remind Doug that it is organized labor that built the roof over his head, put food on his table and made the paper upon which he writes his pseudo letters.

Admittedly, unions aren't perfect; however, they are the worker's only means of bargaining with management on an even basis. Unions have been responsible for more humane working conditions, however, if Doug had his way we'd all be working for 75 cents/hour, 12 hours/day, 7 days/week.

As for his insinuation that college professors are more deserving than Chicago garbagemen, we'd like to quote Woody Allen's prophetic statement: "Those who can't do — teach."

This attitude of Doug's is exactly what big business would like to see. We suggest he switch majors to management. This way he can spend his "lengthy hours of work and study" learning how to exploit workers instead of playing with crayons and pencils in Lawrence Hall.

Paul Hanson
Junior, Computer Science

Alan Levine
Junior, pre-Journalism

Sexpert 'fact' doubted

I would like to point out what I consider to be a serious error made by your "Sexpert" in her column of Oct. 13, 1978 issue of the ODE. In her discussion of transsexualism, she states that the ratio of male-to-female transsexuals compared to female-to-male transsexuals in the U.S. is about 10 to 1.

She then goes on to "explain" this "fact" with a reference to the difficulty of adjusting to the male role in our society. I consider this "explanation" to be uncalled for, since the "fact" is not accurate.

As of 1969, Johns Hopkins University has received several hundred requests for sex change operations. Of the first 500, 79 percent were male, 21 percent female, a ratio of about 4:1. Somewhat later, at Stanford University, in the period 1967-1974, there were 74 sex change operations, 50 male to female and 24 female to male, a ratio of about 2:1.

Since it is well known among all concerned that the successful transformation of the genitals is much easier for the male-to-female transsexual, relatively few female-to-male transsexuals apply for or undergo this conversion operation. Estimates of the actual incidence of transsexualism in the general population vary somewhat widely from a 3:1 ratio to a 2:1 ratio (Reference, Green, R. & Money, J. Eds., "Transsexualism and sex reassignment," Johns Hopkins Press, 1969).

A ratio of 10:1 is highly unlikely. There is at present no adequate explanation of transsexualism, and premature conclusions based on faulty data are not particularly helpful.

Daniel P. Kimble,
Professor, psychology