



greg wasson

tabled indefinitely

As the sixties ended, campus life was marked by rallies, marches and demonstrations. The aim was to force a reevaluation of America's values and morals and to end our involvement in the Southeast Asian mistake. Often, the target was a Washington-based government 3,000 miles away. The statements were loud.

Half a decade later, students seem to be speaking much softer and directing

ours

their efforts at the campus that surrounded them. As tuition levels continued to rise, students became less content with letting the State Board of Higher Education decide what would be offered and how much it would cost. This rising consciousness found expression in the concept of student as consumer. In 1975,

student body president Jim Bernau and his collection of "Bernau-crats" fought to give students a meaningful voice in the setting of University policy.

However, concessions to students were for the most part empty, a fact underscored by the University's mostly symbolic co-governance structure. While paying lip service to the idea of student input, the University systematically denied students a real voice in the running of the institution. The governing structure remained dominated by faculty interests. When there was a conflict between student and faculty, faculty continued to win out.

Today, the conflict seems to be fading. Johnson Hall is profiting from the transitory nature of the ASUO. The fact that students in charge change every year while the administration is stable means most problems can be glossed

over until students and their elected representatives graduate.

That strategy worked.

There are few dedicated student-consumers in residence at the ASUO office. Even dedicated children of the early seventies, like Glen Ozonewood, have to admit that the thrill is gone.

"When I first came here, students were demanding a say in the choice of the new University president. Told to go away, revolutionary crazies poured molten lead in the locks at the administration building. The fervor was quenched by assurances that a new governing structure would be forged at this place — that students would be given real input. Frats were closing down from lack of membership. People were involved. But no more."

Glen's assessment is seconded by George Wickes, head of the English department. Wickes points to the declin-

ing number of SEARCH classes being suggested and taught in the department.

"I've detected a shift even in the last year. Students are more conventional, more docile. They want to be told; they don't want things experimental or innovative; they aren't interested in searching. The guy doing the one SEARCH class that attracted enough students to make it this year isn't doing anything particularly striking or unusual — he's just doing a creative writing class."

So, grumbling all the time, Glen's forced to admit that things are different.

"The other side's just too strong, too pervasive. First we tried to change the country, then pulled back to work on the University and it's sub-units."

The lesson is: The only thing we can really change is ourselves.

yours

Tired of lies

The number one question is no longer "How are you today?"; now it's "Do you mind if I smoke?" and it gets just about as many honest answers. How many times have you responded to a "how are you" question with a "just fine" answer, when really you wanted to say, "I feel like crap; if you've got an hour I'll tell you about it." How many times have you responded negatively to the smoking question, when you desperately wanted to say: "Yes, I mind if you smoke; I enjoy life and I'd like to live as long as possible. I enjoy clean air and I'd like to breathe without choking. I like my clothes to smell like Woolite, not like Old Gold."

Smokers are trying to be considerate in a very inconsiderate fashion. The "Do you mind if I smoke?" question is unfair; it puts you right on the spot.

If smokers looked at what they were asking, they would realize they have no right to ask. What they're really saying is "Do you mind if I shorten your life?", or "Do you mind if I pollute the

air?" or maybe "Do you mind if I make your eyes run, your throat sore, and your stomach sick?" Of course we mind.

What can we do? Either we can continue to be conned into reacting dishonestly, or we can turn the tables. This smoking question deserves an answer — one that will make everyone stop and think. An example of a thought provoking question and response: question, "Do you mind if I smoke?"; answer, "Do you mind if I fart?"

Sharon M. Plews
economics

Stable policy

I am writing in response to Steven D. Hanselman's article entitled "Support is shifting," which appeared in the Emerald (11-9).

In his article, the writer emphasized two themes. The first was that the support for Israel in the U.S. is shifting, and he stated that the reason for the shift is that the American public blames Begin's policy on the West Bank for the rise of the price of oil. The second theme was his opinion that the so called Arab

rejectionist states are war hawks who do not want peace but desire the conflict to continue. To prove it he emphasized the reported build up of Syrian, Iraqi and Jordanian forces.

It just happens that I don't agree with Hanselman's defense of his two themes and I am not referring here to him being biased, although as a history major he should try not to be biased, but, after all, who can truly claim he isn't biased. In my response to his article, I can't claim I am not biased, but for the sake of argument let us hope the best man wins.

First, the shifting of support: I do not think that the American support for Israel has shifted enough to call it a shift. If we look first at the reason for the American support for Israel, we will understand why it will take more to cause a real shift. Americans by nature support minorities and they always side with the so-called underdogs (whether in politics or sports), although Israel could not be defined as an underdog because it has always been better armed and trained. Let us

not forget that the other world powers, no matter what their stands may be during peace time, would never agree to the dismantling of the state of Israel. The only thing that might cause a real shift is if the Americans felt that their national honor was insulted, because they are very proud of their democratic ideas and rights and when they feel these principles are threatened, they will not hesitate to act; history is full of examples.

Hanselman stated that the shift was because of Begin's hard stand on the West Bank issue, which caused the rise in oil prices, and he blamed that on other parties, meaning the OPEC countries. I agree with him concerning the first part but I do not agree with him on blaming OPEC, because he did not mention why they had to raise the price of their oil. The simple answer is that despite the fact that they are producers of oil, they are consumers of other imported goods whose prices also went up. They have to pay to get them and, to get the needed cash, they have to sell their oil at a price that will make them able to meet the bills of their needs and to help them develop. The energy crisis is not only created by the increase in oil prices but also by the greediness of the oil companies and the continued rise in the world consumption of oil. Hanselman put the blame on OPEC but forgot to mention that other oil producing countries such as Canada, Mexico and Britain keep raising the price of their oil to a level higher than that of OPEC's.

Second: Consider the Arab rejectionist states. I do not agree with Hanselman that they oppose peace; I would say they oppose false and unjust peace which does not solve or attempt to solve the real problem, the Palestinians, who have been suffering for four decades. The Camp David Agreement will only prolong their sufferings. He blamed the Arab rejectionist states for being war hawks because they opposed Sadat's theatrical peace play before Camp David, but he failed to recognize the reason was because all signs showed the

way the so-called peace was going. Besides, Sadat was giving in all the time and was not getting any justifiable thing in return. I do not blame Hanselman for believing Sadat because Sadat has misled the world by his play to the point that people cannot recognize that he is a person looking for personal gain. Sadat is such a good actor that I believe he would be a worthy winner of the Oscar rather than the Nobel prize.

Finally, I was disappointed that Hanselman justified the Israeli raids into Lebanon as legitimate acts, without indicating on what grounds he made up his mind.

Farouk M. Taulik
graduate student, history

Sow and reap

Through covert operations and to help international oil companies threatened with nationalization, the U.S. organized and financed the takeover by the shah more than 30 years ago. Since then and until he was forced to flee, the U.S. supported him with weapons, counsel and money, officially ignoring if not actually condoning the outrages regularly committed by the shah's orders on a massive scale — confiscations, tortures, imprisonments and murders.

Perhaps the American public never knew, or those who did forgot. The Iranians students can't forget. Some of them sponsored my visit to Tehran in 1974 to protest these barbaric policies. Amnesty International, with whom I worked on that trip and earlier in Chile, can supply the documentation if you need it. What you sow, the Bible says, you reap.

Charles Porter
former visiting lecturer

Corrections

In Friday's edition of the Emerald, the letter entitled "Two-way street" contained a misspelling of the author's name. The writer's name is spelled Tisdale. We thank her for informing us.

theirs

