

Now that the bomb scare is over, we can get back to the business at hand. Namely, the production of this paper. It takes a great amount of time and effort for a handfull of people to get this paper out every week. The response to our last cry for help was heartening but not sufficient. We still need you! The more people we have, the less effort everyone will have to contribute and the better our copy is going to be. (Just think of how good it will look on your resume.) We will be having a meeting for staff members and those who are interested in becoming a staff member on Monday night at 7:00pm. Why not come up and get involved? You might even enjoy it, and you could learn something in the process. You will never know until you try.

On to some serious issues. As you all must know, the proposals of the Presidents Committee were rejected in Senatè last week. I think we now should take some steps to insure that this same situation does not happen again next year. Just because the proposals were rejected does not mean that we can feel secure. As was brought out by the whole debate, some changes must be made around here and we students should have a say in what these are. If you have any suggestions take them to the student council.

Vicki McMillan



## LETTERS

To the Editor:

It was painful to hear Meincke's patronizing responses and it was painful to hear Joe Revell's replies to those great defenses of the University given by students lately. Joe kept telling us - like a broken record - that the bottom line is economic. This is painful because the last place for the typically business confusion between means and ends should be a university. Joe kept telling us that if we have another solution to THE CRISIS, then we should present it.

Well, here it is: impeach the president, dismiss the deans, and send the school directors back to school. Think of the enormous savings in salaries and pensions for the University - enough to pay for several music departments! Think of the costs that could have been avoided by not having an administration that asks others to find solutions after it has created the problems! Think of the costs of incompetency that the University could have avoided by not having a report that undermines public confidence and support, turns students away, and leads politicians to believe that students

graduate from a department or a majors program instead of a university (see Lee's statement in The Guardian, October 12).

And even better: think of the enormous advantages to the University of having administrators who would be truly responsible to the administered and who thus could be held responsible. Why, we could even have administrators who would earn their (sensible, for a change) salaries, not by asking others to find solutions for the problems they themselves have created, but by doing such things as advertising and promoting the University and its wonderful setting to the world, by actively recruiting students (instead of requiring others, like Music Departments, to do it), by standing up for the University and its programs and opposing a restrictive and destructive economic and political establishment (instead of being part of it), and by solving economic difficulties not by cut-backs but by pressing for expanded and better services. What we have now is not only no way to run a university, it's not even the way to run a railroad.

Sign me:  
PAINED ENOUGH

Dear Editor:

Last week, between meetings, I was relaxing in my easy chair, peeling a banana, and admiring my likeness on the front page of the October 14 issue of The Sun. I had a record playing softly in the background. It was a Kenny Rogers record. I like Kenny's lyrics.

I still had not geared down from the state of excitement generated by the controversy over the issuing of the report of the President's Advisory Group a report I had helped to prepare, and which had just been rejected by the Academic Community.

Naturally, I was disappointed. My disappointment came not from the fact that people disagreed with the individual recommendations in the report. They were hard ones, honestly made, and naturally drew attention. Many of my colleagues told me personally that they disagreed with specific recommendations. I respect their opinions, as indeed I respect the people who expressed them. My disappointment was with the way in which the report was misinterpreted for the media and misrep-

resented internally by certain individuals who made effective use of scare tactics and innuendo in the context of questioning the integrity and motives of the authors of the report. They were also quite effective in describing falsely the way in which the recommendations relating to academic programs were to be dealt with within the Academic Community.

I would hope that all Students still get, somewhere in their course of studies, the old but still sound advice to read, where possible, primary sources of information, and not rely on what others say the primary sources contain. I suggest that those who have not read the complete report carefully, do so, and compare it with what they may have been told about it.

In any event, I am heartened by the interest that the whole Academic Community has taken in this issues involved. We are justifiably proud of the quality of our academic programs, and should not be shy about saying so. Our report was