

Divisiveness at vote brings flaws to light

Faculty and students should be embarrassed by their behavior at Wednesday's University Assembly meeting. Following the assembly's vote to reconsider a revision to the race, gender and non-European studies requirement, the assembly began hearing and voting on several amendments.

The assembly passed an amendment to broaden the requirements of the first of two proposed courses from dealing only with African-Americans, Asian-Americans, Native Americans and Latinos/Chicanos to including all "racial/ethnic minority groups in the U.S.A."

It was then that things turned ugly. Students attending the meeting stormed out while shouting profanities at the assembly. It should be pointed out that this handful of students is in no way representative of the student body as a whole.

Judging by the low turnout at Wednesday's multicultural curriculum support rally, many students at the University are at least apathetic about the requirement, if not opposed to being given the burden of another requirement. While an effective multicultural curriculum is essential to a liberal arts education, the concerns that arise with the addition of further requirements cannot be ignored.

A speaker at the assembly criticized the group for worrying about the financial impact of the revised requirement, telling the assembly that it should concern itself rather with students' futures.

But what do students believe is more important to their futures: The benefit gained by taking one additional required class, or the potential cost of the requirement, which could eventually lead to a greater tuition increase? More than likely it's the latter.

Perhaps the most embarrassing part was the reaction of associate professor Robert Proudfoot, who stormed out of the meeting after loudly accusing the assembly of taking away his voice. This is far from appropriate behavior for someone who is perceived as a role model by some students, and reflects very poorly on the image of faculty at the University.

Both Proudfoot and associate professor Sumi Cho alluded to another troubling aspect of the requirement before it was amended. Proudfoot complained the amendment "lumped (Native Americans) together with everyone else." Cho claimed the reason the requirement was exclusive to the study of only four racial groups was because those groups have suffered more prejudice than others.

This type of selective victimization and competitive suffering indicates that the requirement's result will be to facilitate separatism, not multiculturalism. It should also be considered extremely offensive to members of minority groups not represented in the "Big Four."

To tell a race of people, "you have been oppressed, but we have been oppressed more so we deserve preferential treatment" is exactly the kind of irresponsible thinking that has resulted in the quagmire facing Israel and the Palestinians. Both groups have suffered historical oppression, but both groups believe each has suffered more than the other. Their solution? Shoot at each other.

The only reason there is so much confusion between the two classes is because in many people's minds it's difficult to distinguish between a race and an ethnic group. Fortunately, the assembly took a step in the right direction Wednesday when it moved away from the proposed curriculum that was before it.



COMMENTARY

Are athletic fee cuts reasonable?

Athletic funding cut is more than fair

By Neil Sunnell

Student interests have been poorly served by the Tuesday, May 4 *Emerald* editorial that was critical of the Incidental Fee Committee's decision to allocate \$35,000 less in student incidental fees to the athletic department.

If the *Emerald* had read the department's budget, it would have learned the department's budget is more than \$10 million, not \$1.04 million. If the *Emerald* had bothered to get some facts, it would understand that students paid for 12,000 football tickets they did not use this year.

I must say I was rather impressed the *Emerald* got one fact correct. Indeed, the IFC's most recent cut is the fourth in five years. According to athletic director Rich Brooks, these cuts have totaled about \$200,000. If the *Emerald* did some simple math, it would find that all of the cuts during the past four years total less than 2 percent of the department's operating revenue for one year.

As for the assertion that the IFC should not be making decisions affecting large numbers of students and that such questions should be put to a vote: Welcome to the world of representative democracy. Get used to it.

The IFC is charged with the responsibility of allocating approximately \$4.7 million in student fees. Indeed, the athletic department could have put this matter to a vote of the student body last month. Although this may be an option for next year, it is too late for that course of action now.

The issue is not a question of greed. It is a question of supply and demand. University athletics can only charge what customers are willing to pay. The fact is that 18 percent fewer people on average (not just students) attended football games fall term.

As to the assertion that the athletic department has the prerogative to be as money hungry as it wants, we all have that same prerogative. Unfortunately, the athletic department, like many of us, does not have the resources to sate an endless hunger.

The athletic department made the same threats it is making now. It is wrong for the *Emerald* to pressure the student government to fund the athletic department according to its analysis of the situation. Furthermore, students should not be misled by the faulty arguments forwarded by the *Emerald*.

Where was the *Emerald* when these issues surfaced? As far as I know, the *Emerald* has not main-

Athletic department cannot sustain cuts

By Sandy Walton

As the result of a general election ballot measure in the spring of 1987, the Incidental Fee Committee provides an annual direct subsidy to the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics for all women's sports, co-ed sports, and men's sports except football and men's basketball.

In consideration for this support, students receive 6,098 tickets for football, 3,523 tickets for men's basketball, the locations for both of which are stipulated in the contract, and unlimited admission to all other athletic events.

When submitting the budget for the 1993-94 fiscal year to the IFC, the athletic department did not request an increase in dollars, did not request the restoration of any previous cuts, nor has it ever asked for any changes in student ticket numbers or location. However, the IFC and ASUO recommended a cut of \$35,000, marking the fourth straight year the budget has been reduced. The budget was previously cut \$40,000 in 1990-91, \$57,450 in 1991-92 and \$54,566 in 1992-93. The time for seating changes may have arrived.

The cumulative effect of these cuts is enormous. The IFC support in 1987-88 accounted for 77 percent of subsidized expenses for which it was earmarked, but now covers only 46 percent. IFC funding was 12.9 percent of the total budget but now is only 7.8 percent.

The total incidental fee in 1987-88 was about \$75 per student per term, of which athletics received about \$25. The incidental fee is currently about \$107 per term, of which athletics receives \$22.

During these same six years, tuition has increased 104 percent and 113 percent for in-state and out-of-state respectively. Salaries and wages have increased almost 20 percent. Travel has risen more than 15 percent. Had the public bought these same seats, the market value would have been \$1.238 million in 1987-88 and \$1.717 million in 1992-93.

Public ticket prices have risen 19 percent for football and 20 percent for men's basketball. During these years, student price support has dropped from 93 percent of the market value in 1987-88 to 60 percent in 1992-93.

Despite these cuts and constantly rising expenses, and recognizing the financial difficulties faced by students, athletics has not reduced the number of tickets nor changed seating loca-

Oregon Daily Emerald

P.O. BOX 3154 EUGENE, OREGON 97403

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published daily Monday through Friday during the school year and Tuesday and Thursday during the summer by the Oregon Daily Emerald Publishing Co. Inc., at the University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

The Emerald operates independently of the University with offices at Suite 300 of the Erb Memorial Union and is a member of the Associated Press.

The Emerald is private property. The unlawful removal or use of papers is prosecutable by law.

Editor: Pat Malach	Freelance Editor: Mandy Baucum
News Editor: Jake Berg	Editorial Editor: Rivers Janssen
Graphics Editor: Martin Fisher	Sports Editor: Dave Charbonneau
Entertainment Editor: Jeff Paslay	Supplements Editor: Calley Anderson
Freya Horn	
Night Editor: Pat Malach	

Associate Editors: Tammy Batey, Student Government/Activities; Daralyn Trappe, Community; Colleen Pohlig, Higher Education/Administration

News Staff: Chester Allen, Matt Bender, Justin Brown, Sarah Clark, Meg Dedolph, Amy Devenport, Jen Ellison, Amanda Fernie, Anthony Forney, Beth Hege, Teresa Huntsinger, Rebecca Merritt, Steve Mims, Katy Moeller, Tiffini Mueller, Trista Noel, Ellen Shaw, Erick Studenicka, Marion Sultor, Randy Thieben, Michele Thompson-Aguar, Amy Van Tuyt, Todd Williams, Clayton Yee