

Non-smoking sign barely noticeable in cafeteria room

By Sandy Carter
Of The Print

I consider myself a good observer. At least I **did** consider myself a good observer. But the new "No Smoking" sign in the cafeteria has me doubting my own powers of observation. I've been watching for the promised sign for several weeks now, impatience gnawing at me. Finally, Friday, I decided to take the bull by the horns and ask at the student government office. I finished lunch, dumped my tray, and headed across the Community Center, determined to solve the mystery.

ASG Secretary Terri McCoy met my question with a puzzled

frown. "It is up!" she said.

"No it isn't," I argued. "I just ate in there and there was no sign!"

Well, of course, she was right. There is a sign. But it doesn't hang where I expected to see it. Suspended on chains from the center of the Intimate Dining Room ceiling, rather than in the doorway, it announces in no uncertain terms that there will be no smoking in that area between the hours of 11:30 a.m. and 1 p.m.

How long the sign had hung there without attracting my attention, I don't know. I just hope that others, keener observers than myself, have gotten the new message.



feedback

Folding of art society raises questions

"We, the students of Clackamas Community College Art Center, are pulling our ideas and energies together to create, for the first time on campus, an art society. The prime objective of the Art Society is to become a working tool for the promotion, participation and understanding of the Arts.

Membership to the Art Society is not limited to the fine art student but is open to all students on campus, alumni and the community at large."

Dear Editor:

This is a paragraph from a promotional letter passed around in late January. What I'd like to know is what happened to all this potential? The premature folding of the Art Society creates some definite contradictions to the sentiments stated above. It has set another obstacle in the path of self expression and has reduced the student and community to a passive role in the arts.

It was stated in the April 2 edition of The Print that the folding of the art club was "no big thing" because technically there was no Art Society due to the rejection of the constitution by the ASG.

This shallow perception is a direct insult to the faithful members who spent their lunch hours each Thursday involved in meetings. Technically, we would not be sponsored by

ASG; officially, we were an organized body in its early stages. Technically, our constitution simply had to specify exactly who we did not discriminate against. The list didn't seem to be long enough.

Unfortunately, like many new endeavors, there were problems. John Brittingham stated, "The controlled aspect of it discouraged a lot of people from volunteering." I tend to agree but not for the same reasons assumed by such a statement. It implies that the organization was rigid when in fact it was not. What did put a damper on the situation was the controlled opinion and influence which came down from the art center's administration.

Perhaps the most significant example of this control was the appointment of Leland John as gallery manager. This change of control was done without the knowledge and consent of the Art Society members who had originally appointed Jeanette Huslar, a student, to the position.

This point related to the sentiment that apathy sealed the fate of the club. Of course, wouldn't you be apathetic, too, when you realized that your decisions were overridden by a -power who stated it was uninformed?

Another interesting point was the comment that, "an organization of this kind would have worked better at a four-year college." Such a statement is absurd. It reflects a

limited attitude toward the potential endeavors of self expression and is a limited view of the arts in general. There is no sound reasoning behind such a statement, and it is discouraging to realize that such an attitude exists in the art center administration. If the organization remained autonomous from the opportunist attitude of the AC's administration, then a significant structure would have existed for the students and community to use.

This relates to the final point that needs to be made clear at this time. It was stated that "nothing has been lost; we will capture the good and take off with them."

"We always function better per project and idea and we don't need a society to do that."

What I'd like to know is, who is WE?? We, the students and community? We, the people involved in the AC building? Or, we the AC administration? Who are WE?

I ally myself with the "we" that represents the students, the AC building and the community at large. In this respect, we have lost a great deal.

We have lost a significant say in the policies dictated by the AC administration. We have lost a prime opportunity to gather constructively. But of paramount importance, we have lost our freedom to create and share our self expression in a manner that will benefit all.

The gap between the people and their identification with the arts has been widened and the space in between has been filled with the bland air of

pseudo professionalism. Close this gap; support the informal art society.

Jeff Silvia

Print, ASG 'bitching' needs to end soon

To The Students:

The Print and ASG have been at each other's throats for too long. Bitch. Bitch. Bitch. Week in and week out, you can hear people complaining how the student government is impotent and how The Print is intellectually bland, and how apathetic all the students are.

Well, that's not entirely true. The student senators and officers who volunteer their very precious time do create a service. If you're not satisfied, do something to improve that service. Bitch at the senate and you should expect some heat back.

The Print volunteers seem to be of the same nature. I say "seem" because I really don't know. There have been stories that I haven't been satisfied with, and pictures that didn't particularly please me; but that's merely the end product.

CCC students should be

both proud of their fellow students and willing to communicate constructively with each other.

I think it was Thomas Jefferson who said, "Citizens get the government (service) they deserve." Please feel free to correct me.

If you want to bitch, pitch in, too. I felt that The Print could have covered the forum discussions better. But, I was a participant in those events and that bias (position) and experience may have clouded my perception. Although The Print didn't cover one forum and didn't publish the opinions of those who had the moxie to speak up, you and me—"the students"—said nothing and did nothing. Consequently, we have the quality of journalism and governmental services we deserve.

Phillip Boitnott
Captain of Debate Team

Page 3

Wednesday, April 9, 1980

