

## Only a plus dropping P.E. requirement

Not every laceration rendered by the flashing budget blade is to be lamented as a wound fatal to the University. There are some cuts which are being met with a nod of approval.

One such "approved" cut was recommended Wednesday by the University Senate. The senate voted 28-3 in favor of dropping the five-credit undergraduate physical education requirement.

The physical education requirement has been a longstanding controversy among students and the University. It took the necessity of an ever-tightening University budget to resolve the issue.

Good sense and economics agree that dropping the physical education requirements will benefit the University.

Students have greeted the news that they may no longer have to take five credits of physical education with a certain amount of celebration. More often than not the classes were dreaded.

The matter isn't entirely resolved though. The University Senate has made its recommendation to the Faculty Assembly. They in turn will either reject the recommendation, or vote approval. The outcome of the Faculty Assembly vote determines whether or not the five-credit physical education requirement will stand or be dropped.

There are more administration voices in favor of dropping the physical education requirement than in letting it stand. The economic side notwithstanding, Michael Ellis, department head has been quoted as saying the changes may be the best thing that could happen to the activities classes.

Ellis wants to restructure the physical education program so more activities classes are available. They would be designed along the lines

of community education classes. Students would pay nominal fees for individual classes.

This idea is one that will certainly be successful. Student response will determine the viability of an activity. It allows students a choice of what activities to pursue. It also makes the activities more streamlined and competitive for the student—and community—dollar.

Dropping the required physical education classes saves the University \$141,000 according to Provost Richard Hill. Hill maintains, and rightly

so, that this savings can be translated into the funds needed to maintain other programs. Those programs Hill is attempting to save aren't specified, but it's hoped they are worthwhile.

The Emerald supports the University Senate's recommendation to drop the five-credit physical education requirement. Not only is it a good idea that helps to trim the University budget toward that magic 4 percent mark, it sacrifices an unpopular requirement for more important academic programs.

THE EMERALD, OCTOBER 23, 1981

OPINION



WELL, YES... HE IS A RECESSION. BUT HE'S ONLY A LITTLE ONE.

CAREFUL - THE ONLY WAY TO SURVIVE IS TO BE CAREFUL OF YOURSELF.

## letters

### Media money

Isn't it terrible? People are planning boycotts against sponsors of certain television shows to protest offensive programming! You would think the end of the "free press" was near if you listened to the spokesmen of television and newspaper companies opposing the action. But if you believe a "free press" presently exists you're quite wrong. It's actually very expensive.

Some falsely assume that most television networks and newspapers are concerned with morals, ethics and truth. Ha! Making money is their main concern. Media is a multi-million-dollar industry due to advertising. So don't expect a magazine like Newsweek ("News-week" describes it better) or CBS to take stands which might offend advertisers. Truth can hurt—profit margins, that is.

That's the reason the media is attacking those planning to use their right to boycott corporations who sponsor certain programming. The businesses involved stand to lose millions if the idea spreads.

Society chastizes people engaging in promiscuity and immorality, but it's about time America went after those most responsible for promoting it—corporate organizations. We're constantly urged by messages in commercials to wear certain clothes or drink certain beverages so we can belong to the "in-group." Immorality and conceit are pushed as desirable outcomes of the popularity gained when using their products and conforming to their wishes.

Kathleen Nolan, president of the Screen Actors Guild, has stated: "The heads of the networks are parasites and tasteless mercenaries. They've trashed up the airways almost beyond repair. It's a subhuman situation." In reference to media influencing American values, the late Bing Crosby wrote: "I fear that they are depicting life as it is going to be if they are not diverted." If boycotting products can force corporations to change unethical practices, then what's wrong with that? Remember—businesses are most vulnerable in their pocketbook region.

Michael Cross  
Junior, political science

### Beating thieves

I am outraged by the actions to be taken by Campus Security in its campaign against bike theft. As described in the (Oct. 16) Emerald: "Campus Security will cut the chains of unregistered bikes and take them to the security office," according to the resident "crime prevention" specialist. Apparently she feels that by

beating other thieves to the punch using their own methods, security guards will somehow reduce campus bike thefts! I fail to see how the unauthorized cutting of a bicycle chain and the removal of the bicycle is a crime when it is done by a private individual, but not when it is done by a Campus Security person. Confiscation of property without notice or warrant is illegal. Last I heard, even the city cops give you a ticket for parking an unlicensed vehicle on the streets—they don't break into your car and tow it away. Campus Security can give me a ticket if it finds my bike violates its (probably unlawful anyway) registration requirement. But if it cuts my chain and impounds my bike, it can expect to be sued for vandalism and unlawful confiscation of my property.

A university should be one place where people realize that you don't enforce laws by breaking them. Property rights, like other human rights, are not protected when the police are the first to violate them. "U of O's Finest" need to be reminded of that fact.

Linda Erz  
Graduate, instructional technology

### PNRC decision

My biggest problem with Pres. Olum's "tentative" decision to move the Pacific Northwest Resources Center off campus is that this decision accomplishes little except virtually insuring that the environmental law clinic shall lose its major source of funding.

By moving the PNRC off campus, President Olum does not change the fact that University students and professors shall, through the University's legal clinics, be zealously advocating controversial public policy issues. This is good for advocacy is the job of the lawyer and all involved agree that the existence of law clinics greatly helps to bridge the chasm that too often exists between academia and reality. Pres. Olum has, in fact, given his endorsement of the continued existence of the clinics at the law school. Thus, despite Olum's decision to move the PNRC off campus, it will still be the case that University students and professors will be advocating controversial positions. Now, however, if the PNRC funds such advocacy, students shall have to run across the street or downtown for their clinical training.

So, what's the difference?

The difference is that, by his decision, Olum, knowingly or not, is reinforcing the use of high pressure political tactics to influence University educational policy. Those who have attacked the PNRC will not stop their attacks now. They have no reason to. Can we trust that Paul Olum will not knuckle under to continued attacks upon the very existence of the environmental

clinic, or the criminal defense clinic, or any other arguably controversial educational offering at the University for the reason that these offerings also compromise "institutional neutrality"?

And is Pres. Olum willing to extend his "principled... tentative decision" in an even-handed manner throughout the University community? If he doesn't, can we truly call this decision a "principled" one? Will ROTC stay on campus? Are they any less compromising of the University's neutrality on a controversial public policy issue? Will the YMCA stay? Are they not both a sexist and religious organization endorsed by the University by their presence on campus? The inevitable question is what are the real "principles" involved?

Why not recognize the reality of the situation, that a diversity of organizations with varied positions on controversial public policy issues exist on campus and that this is not necessarily a bad thing. Shouldn't the basis of Paul Olum's decision be the value of the educational opportunity afforded by the PNRC and not whether it stands for this or that?

Perhaps most bothersome is Pres. Olum's failure to consult with those most affected by his "tentative" decision until long after that decision was apparently made. Olum has failed to be open with the law school student body about agreements that were made between himself and state officials months before Olum's forum at the law school. One wonders why Olum came to the law school at all.

There is danger lurking, for without a clear expression of the criteria upon which Olum made his "principled" decision to move the PNRC off campus and then even-handed application of these criteria to all University housed programs, who is to say what Pres. Olum will decide when "his conscience" speaks next.

Jim Melamed  
Third year law

### letters policy

The Emerald will accept and attempt to print all letters containing fair comment on issues, ideas and topics of interest to the University community.

The letters **must** be limited to 250 words, signed, and the identification of the writer must be verified when the letter is turned in to The Emerald offices, EMU 300.

The Emerald reserves the right to edit any letter for length, style or content. Publication is dependent upon the space available.