Chicanos blast Hesburgh policy

by Dave Lammers

Two hundred Chicanos met last week in the Continuing Education Center of Notre Dame and drew up a list of demands which call for the resignation of Father Hesburgh as head of the Civil Rights Commission, increased support of the Chicano student, by Notre Dame, by increasing Chicano enrollment, and establishing a greater interaction between Notre Dame and the local Mexican-American population.

Gilbert Cardenas, a Chicano from Los Angeles and a graduate student at Notre Dame, strongly condemned the inaction of Father Hesburgh, the University of Notre Dame and the Catholic Church, concerning the plight of the Chicanos. Cardenas wrote Father Hesburgh last January 28 and pointed out that there are only about twenty Chicanos attending Notre Dame, and only one Chicano professor. Cardenas, in his letter to Hesburgh, asked what the University policy of the college was concerning its commitment toward recruitment of Mexican-American in the South Bend area, and listed suggestions for increased University action in the Chicano cause.

Fr. Hesburgh replied to Cardenas' letter on February 5, saying "I read your letter with great interest and must assure you that there is no disregard or disagreement between your ideas and mine in the matter you discuss. The only problem is of finances, since what you are talking about would cost several hundred dollars and the University is already $900,000 in arrears in this year's operating budget. If you have any idea how this extra money might be raised to mount a program such as I suggest, I would be very happy to hear from you."

Cardenas contends that Father Hesburgh ignored his list of suggestions for increased Chicoano enrollment, and questions regarding university policy and commented only upon the problem of finances. Cardenas says, "Hesburgh took the familiar but traditional position that the burden of change rests upon the Chicanos themselves, thus abdusting the University of its social responsibility for change as well as its moral responsibility toward Chicoanos as Catholics."

Cardenas contends that there is a great divergence between Father Hesburgh's public statements and his contribution to the Chicano cause as head of the Civil Rights Commission and as president of Notre Dame. Cardenas points to Father Hesburgh's statement in The South Bend Tribune, where Hesburgh said, "Until we have real equality of opportunity there will be little and too present danger of creating two separate societies within the nation. The status of the nation's six million Mexican-Americans is even worse than that of the twenty million Blacks in the country."

(continued on page 3)

Black athletes dissatisfied

Three black athletes yesterday expressed dissatisfaction with the university's publicity concerning financial aid to black students.

In expressing their dissatisfaction, Tom Gatwater, Bob Minus and Clarence Ellis noted that the university claims that 91% of all black students receive aid, the total aid being $174,460. However, approximately $43,000 of that aid goes to 14 black athletes.

A brochure prepared by the Afro-American Society states that "The black athletes constitute 18.5% of the black students on financial aid, and they receive the largest average amount of aid - $3,100, which is also the largest average amount of aid offered to the non-black student."

Ellis said that "the Administration is coming up with facts that are misleading. I think the facts tend to give the impression that the black-non-athlete has it easy. I take a personal view that what the black athlete needs is more attention than what the black-non-athlete gets."

Denis Mccoy

"If indeed conditions worsen, some black student will make decisions at the point in time when they will be necessary and then you might as well forget the strongholds of freedom that you cherish." If facts are going to be given, they must be stated as they truly are."

In another prepared statement, Dr. Liu said last night: "I cannot solve a problem by using technical means. I feel that the problem could not be viewed from someone else's eye, because of the great "intereventration of factors."

Dr. Griffith summed up the discussion that had just taken place in the Law Auditorium. The two hour discussion included Fr. Charles Shady, Jr., Willis Nutting, Dr. William Liu and Dr. Falvio de Silva, and Dr. Griffith.

Although there were no heated arguments or major disagreements among the participants, there were possible areas that were stressed by each. In particular, Dr. Liu called for an awareness that "if you put much money you put into it, you cannot solve a problem by using technical means." He went on to say that "the fact is that we are grouped in as one big happy family. I think that is more important than finding out who is black and who isn't black.

Ecology panel considers population dilemma

Ecology panel considers population dilemma

Dr. Griffith countered that to "Everybody might be all right now, but within ten years we might have a nightmare."

Griffith stated that although the problem would seem to be in other countries, that the United States was using resources "at the expense of the rest of the world."

Griffith agreed that although the problem would seem to be in other countries, that the United States was using resources "at the expense of the rest of the world."

Underlining the basic complexity of the problem, Fr. Sheedy said, "The deep, hidden first principles that rule our thinking more than the arguments we use."

The difference in ideologies, cultures and awareness that all of the panel commented upon lead to a question from the audience concerning how all of these factions might be brought together.

Both Dr. Liu and Dr. Griffith said that the method was not known.

But Dr. Nutting did call for "research and active programs against academics sitting around contemplating their navels."

One point of minor controversy was brought up by Fr. Sheedy when he disagreed with the practice of abortion from a moral standpoint calling it "killing of unborn human life." He made it clear that he was not speaking from a "legalistic" viewpoint and that the issue in the final analysis must be left up to the individual.

Commenting on Fr. Sheedy's comments on abortion, Dr. Nutting noted that "there was no telling what populations of other countries would be without abortions." He cited the example of Brazil where he claimed that fifty percent or more of the births are not reported.

Dr. Griffith countered that this would inevitably have to come about either voluntarily or through illegal means.

(continued on page 10)

Dr. Liu said last night: *...* you cannot solve a problem by using technical means."

"The Church and Social" magazine

(continued on page 3)
‘Polarization’ prevalent on SLC

by Steve Hoffman
Observer News Editor

Amidst a steady stream of debate and compromise, the SLC resolved in yesterday’s special session to transmit a statement, drafted by student member Rich Meckel, dealing with the Trustees’ recent letter on hall life, to an ad hoc committee of the Board of Trustees as a preface to the Trustees’ meeting on Thursday and Friday of next week.

Although Meckel’s statement was not approved on all particulars, the SLC voted to support the “priorities” of the statement.

Fr. James Burtchaell opened the meeting with a series of remarks to the effect that the SLC has worked important and noticeable changes over several Council members during the previous two years. Specifically, Burtchaell mentioned that such members as Mr. Faccenda and Fr. Riehle have been moving by their experiences on the Council to a better awareness of student life.

However, Burtchaell claimed that a polarization of blocs on the Council has become evident the past year.

“We have felt no persuasion among ourselves this year, and have allowed conviction to slip away,” he stated.

He observed that Dave Krashay’s resolution to reject the Trustees’ letter indicated this polarization since the resolution failed to convince faculty or administration. Contending that these men are just as important as the students, Burtchaell proceeded to offer his conception of the feasibility of hall autonomy.

Cling student drinking problems, vandalism, the failure of Student Government to recongnize racial conflicts in Alumni Hall, and general campus disorder, Burtchaell concluded that students don’t face up to these problems.

“Students will not obey rules of their own making,” he declared, “No one at Notre Dame is autonomous. Everyone must answer to someone.”

Burtchaell reasoned that continued conflict within the SLC would accomplish nothing, nor would the repeated exchange of documents with the Trustees. He moved that a special committee be appointed to meet with the Trustees for the purpose of a direct discussion of student concerns, but was ruled out of order by the chair.

Responding to Burtchaell’s remarks, Meckel maintained that even though he recognized the subordination of the SLC to the Trustees, he must propose rejection of the Trustees’ letter regarding parietals and hall life since seven of the eight student members, representing students in general, reacted against the Trustees’ action.

Quoting Fr. Hesburgh as saying that “the SLC voice is one I must listen to,” Meckel argued that student opinion must be heard.

In reading from his prepared statement, Meckel agreed to Burtchaell’s designation of campus problems, and stated “we’re blind if we believe students making rules is the only solution to these problems.”

He stressed that these problems must be dealt with by looking at their causes, not simply their results. Pointing to a definite misunderstanding between the SLC and the Trustees on hall life, Meckel stated that the subordination of SLC to Trustees cannot be regarded as “arbitrarily” acceptance of everything the Trustees dictate.

Meckel observed that the urgency of the students regarding the establishment of a viable hall life was not satisfied by the letter. He termed it “unfortunate” that only one paragraph in the letter dealt with hall life, that it concerned itself primarily with control and regulation, and that it failed to treat the causes of hall problems.

Accusing the Trustees of offering a “simplified view” of hall life regarding the function of rectors, the qualifications of resident assistants, and the implementation of a judicial system, Meckel contended that students will not accept rules and regulations only because they have existed in the past.

“You are denying the capacity of students to act in the best interests of the hall, and your response reflects traditional, punitive responses to hall problems,” he quoted from his statement.

Regarding parietals, Meckel maintained that in asserting limitations, the Trustees have failed to justify them to the students. He blamed the Trustees for refusing to confront a true philosophy of the residence hall.

Meckel concluded his statement with three proposals to be directed to the Trustees.

He presented plans for a study of a residence hall philosophy, for a study on the improvement of hall staffs with financial increases, and for a philosophy of discipline which would make the student of primary, and an abstract concept of Notre Dame of secondary, importance.

Fr. Burtchaell countered Meckel by reminding him that the Council would be divided on several issues enumerated in the statement.

Faculty member Professor Hock, while upholding the spirit of Meckel’s statement and points of emphasis, declined to endorse the statement in full because he felt “hesitant to charge another body with high crimes and misdemeanors.”

Meckel replied that he could have drafted a “satisfying” statement, but felt that in such a case the issues would fail to be recognized.

Special Assistant to the President Philip Faccenda suggested that, instead of corresponding through letters, it would be more effective for the SLC to convey a response to the Trustees before the official meeting next week.

Meckel agreed that the statement would better serve as a preface to a call for a meeting with the Trustees.

Therefore, a committee consisting of two SLC student members, one faculty member, one administration member, and two hall presidants was proposed for the purpose of directing Meckel’s statement, the priorities of which were approved by the Council, to the Trustees.

After further debate and complaints, the motion for the above action was passed by a vote of twelve to nine.
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‘Polarization’ prevalent on SLC

by Steve Hoffman
Observer News Editor

Amidst a steady stream of debate and compromise, the SLC resolved in yesterday’s special session to transmit a statement, drafted by student member Rich Meckel, dealing with the Trustees’ recent letter on hall life, to an ad hoc committee of the Board of Trustees as a preface to the Trustees’ meeting on Thursday and Friday of next week.

Although Meckel’s statement was not approved on all particulars, the SLC voted to support the “priorities” of the statement.

Fr. James Burtchaell opened the meeting with a series of remarks to the effect that the SLC has worked important and noticeable changes over several Council members during the previous two years. Specifically, Burtchaell mentioned that such members as Mr. Faccenda and Fr. Riehle have been moving by their experiences on the Council to a better awareness of student life.

However, Burtchaell claimed that a polarization of blocs on the Council has become evident the past year.

“We have felt no persuasion among ourselves this year, and have allowed conviction to slip away,” he stated.

He observed that Dave Krashay’s resolution to reject the Trustees’ letter indicated this polarization since the resolution failed to convince faculty or administration. Contending that these men are just as important as the students, Burtchaell proceeded to offer his conception of the feasibility of hall autonomy.

Cling student drinking problems, vandalism, the failure of Student Government to recognize racial conflicts in Alumni Hall, and general campus disorder, Burtchaell concluded that students don’t face up to these problems.

“Students will not obey rules of their own making,” he declared, “No one at Notre Dame is autonomous. Everyone must answer to someone.”

Burtchaell reasoned that continued conflict within the SLC would accomplish nothing, nor would the repeated exchange of documents with the Trustees. He moved that a special committee be appointed to meet with the Trustees for the purpose of a direct discussion of student concerns, but was ruled out of order by the chair.

Responding to Burtchaell’s remarks, Meckel maintained that even though he recognized the subordination of the SLC to the Trustees, he must propose rejection of the Trustees’ letter regarding parietals and hall life since seven of the eight student members, representing students in general, reacted against the Trustees’ action.

Quoting Fr. Hesburgh as saying that “the SLC voice is one I must listen to,” Meckel argued that student opinion must be heard.

In reading from his prepared statement, Meckel agreed to Burtchaell’s designation of campus problems, and stated “we’re blind if we believe students making rules is the only solution to these problems.”

He stressed that these problems must be dealt with by looking at their causes, not simply their results. Pointing to a definite misunderstanding between the SLC and the Trustees on hall life, Meckel stated that the subordination of SLC to Trustees cannot be regarded as “arbitrarily” acceptance of everything the Trustees dictate.

Meckel observed that the urgency of the students regarding the establishment of a viable hall life was not satisfied by the letter. He termed it “unfortunate” that only one paragraph in the letter dealt with hall life, that it concerned itself primarily with control and regulation, and that it failed to treat the causes of hall problems.

Accusing the Trustees of offering a “simplified view” of hall life regarding the function of rectors, the qualifications of resident assistants, and the implementation of a judicial system, Meckel contended that students will not accept rules and regulations only because they have existed in the past.

“You are denying the capacity of students to act in the best interests of the hall, and your response reflects traditional, punitive responses to hall problems,” he quoted from his statement.

Regarding parietals, Meckel maintained that in asserting limitations, the Trustees have failed to justify them to the students. He blamed the Trustees for refusing to confront a true philosophy of the residence hall.

Meckel concluded his statement with three proposals to be directed to the Trustees.

He presented plans for a study of a residence hall philosophy, for a study on the improvement of hall staffs with financial increases, and for a philosophy of discipline which would make the student of primary, and an abstract concept of Notre Dame of secondary, importance.

Fr. Burtchaell countered Meckel by reminding him that the Council would be divided on several issues enumerated in the statement.

Faculty member Professor Hock, while upholding the spirit of Meckel’s statement and points of emphasis, declined to endorse the statement in full because he felt “hesitant to charge another body with high crimes and misdemeanors.”

Meckel replied that he could have drafted a “satisfying” statement, but felt that in such a case the issues would fail to be recognized.

Special Assistant to the President Philip Faccenda suggested that, instead of corresponding through letters, it would be more effective for the SLC to convey a response to the Trustees before the official meeting next week.

Meckel agreed that the statement would better serve as a preface to a call for a meeting with the Trustees.

Therefore, a committee consisting of two SLC student members, one faculty member, one administration member, and two hall presidants was proposed for the purpose of directing Meckel’s statement, the priorities of which were approved by the Council, to the Trustees.

After further debate and complaints, the motion for the above action was passed by a vote of twelve to nine.
Mexican-Americans criticize Hesburgh

"We are charging that Reverend Hesburgh is contributing to the creation of two separate societies within the nation by representing an institution that discriminates against Chicano," Cardenas says. "We are demanding that Hesburgh resign from the US Civil Rights Commission and that a Federal and Congressional investigation of the racist, economic and discriminatory practices by the University on the Chicano community be undertaken.

The Chicano conference last weekend endorsed three demands. First, that admission policies be modified so that Mexican-American students who may not meet formal academic standards, but who show promising potential and motivation, be admitted. "This involves providing necessary financial support, providing counseling and orientation, seeking training, and appointing a Mexican-American administrative assistant and initiating a Chicano studies program that gives proper attention to aspects of Mexican civilization in the Western Hemisphere."

Secondly, the Chicanos feel that the University must foster a greater interaction between Notre Dame and the local Mexican-American community, i.e. permanent residents and migrant farmworkers. "The University must develop supportive programs to educate the academic community, i.e. students, personnel, and faculty as to the needs and problems facing the Chicano community."

Third, that the University set up through the Urban Studies Program a Chicano information center that would serve the Midwest.

Cardenas places his demands on Notre Dame in the context of the moral obligation of the Catholic Church. "These demands are not without foundation. They reflect the growing Chicano sentiment toward institutions of higher education, especially those that purport to be Christian institutions."

Cardenas indicated that he hopes to meet with Father Hesburgh in the near future to discuss the actions of the Chicano convention last weekend.

"Father Hesburgh has no alternative but to respond to the needs and demands of the Chicanos, that is, if he claims to be a Christian. More than 100 minority students have applied for financial aid for next year. Of these at least 90% are black students. Puerto Rican, Mexican-Americans, American Indians, and Spanish surname students comprise the remaining applicants.

"The amount and distribution of funds including program priorities indicate the necessity for aggressive self defense on part of the minorities, especially the Chicanos."

C.A.F. ANIMATED FILMS

Thurs.-Award winning shorts
Fri.-Disney's "Alice in Wonderland" and "A World is Born", sequence of Fantasia
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The unborn child is in fact a human being from the moment of his conception. This could easily be demonstrated at length. It is so clearly a scientific fact that we teach it as such in our schools. As the fifth grade sex education text in the New York City school system flatly says, "Human life begins when the sperm cells of the father and the egg cells of the mother unite." When the child in the womb weighs only 1/30th of an ounce he has every internal organ he will ever have as an adult. On the eighteenth day after his conception his heart starts beating. At eighteen weeks, he can suck his thumb, scratch himself and even cry, although he makes no sound because there is no air in the womb. He can feel pain. Even if you somehow do not believe that the child in the womb is a living human being, you ought at least to give him the benefit of the doubt.

Incidentally, it is increasingly clear that the fusion of the abortion and population control movements underlies the implicit coercion of welfare clients and other poor people into undergoing abortion. The overtures of coercion are unmistakable when welfare caseworkers "suggest" that their pregnant clients consider abortion to resolve their "problems" and to ease the taxpayer burden. The idea seems to be to eliminate poverty by eliminating the poor. Of course this is a form of genocide. Instead of working constructively to alleviate poverty, the abortion proponents turn to the mindless and cruel solution of death for the helpless child in the womb. Moreover, in Sweden, Japan, Sweden and Hungary indicates that legalization of abortion does not decrease the number of "back-street" illegal abortions.

People sometimes support abortion because they do not realize what it is. Until the twelfth week after conception, a commonly held belief is the entrance to the uterus and curettage. Dr. Alan Guttmacher detailed this method in the Clinical Obstetrics and Gynecology Journal: "A sharp curette is then inserted to the top of the fundus with very little force, for it is remembered that the lining is very fragile during the first twelve weeks. The curette is then withdrawn several times bringing out pieces of placenta and sac. A small ovum is then visualized and the cavity to which it belongs, much like an eutonic tugging for oxygen... in pregnancies beyond the seventh week, fetal parts are recognizable as they are removed piecemeal."

When Dr. Guttmacher mentions "fetal parts," he means an arm, a leg, a head and other parts of what moments before was a living, though small, human body.

Beyond the fourteenth week of pregnancy, the child can be killed in two ways. One is to inject fluid or gasoline into the womb. As Dr. H.P. Dunn described it, the baby can be felt to make a few convulsive movements, and within a few minutes it dies. In about twenty-four hours labor starts and the already disintegrating baby is delivered. By this means, of course, the baby is simply picked alive. The other technique is hysterotomy, where an incision is made in the mother's abdomen and the child is lifted out. Mrs. Jill Knight, a Member of Parliament in England, described an abortion of this type which she witnessed in Sweden. Her description reminds us that an abortion climate generates a callousness toward life.

"In Sweden, if the child has not been killed by the operation, they drown it in a bucket like a kitten. The child will kick miserably until it dies. "They also do experiments on aborted babies. Put them in simulated wombs and feed them through the chord, picking them up to see if they are still alive."

"Why not, I was told - no one wants these babies."

If an innocent human being can be killed because he is too young, that is, he has not lived nine months from conception, there is no reason in principle why he cannot be killed because he is too old. Or too retarded. Or too black. Or too politically unbearable. The philosophy is Nazi Germany's. And this nation is adopting it.

Almost two-thirds of the Pentagon's budget goes to the so-called "General Purposes Forces," which includes all the men and equipment in the military establishment except those in the army of the air. The Pentagon is the nuclear arsenal of the air, the army of the air, the air arsenal of the air, and the air arsenal of the air. It is the army of the air.

The military budget is based on the premise that American armies must always be prepared to fight three major wars ("contingencies") among the great powers. Moreover, we must always be prepared to fight three major wars ("contingencies") among the great powers, and we must always be prepared to fight three major wars ("contingencies") among the great powers.

The United States has made commitments to 42 countries to defend them against outside aggression. Except in one or two cases, the interests of the American people in these commitments has never been publicly debated. They were all undertaken years ago under radically different circumstances. Based on these assumptions that the U.S. has pledged to defend 42 countries from external attack and that we must be ready to fight three wars at once the present military budget is too low. U.S. forces are prepared to meet two types of wars: conventional warfare, where one nation attacks another and counter-insurgency warfare where the U.S. as in Vietnam and Laos, adds a government in putting down a revolutionary challenge.

Despite the more moderate language in President Nixon's foreign policy statements and despite the rising uproar among hitherto acquiescent or somnolent members of Congress, it still seems that the three war objective is basically unchanged. The United States has made commitments to 42 countries to defend them against outside aggression. Except in one or two cases, the interests of the American people in these commitments has never been publicly debated. They were all undertaken years ago under radically different circumstances.

Based on these assumptions that the U.S. has pledged to defend 42 countries from external attack and that we must be ready to fight three wars at once the present military budget is too low. U.S. forces are prepared to meet two types of wars: conventional warfare, where one nation attacks another and counter-insurgency warfare where the U.S. as in Vietnam and Laos, adds a government in putting down a revolutionary challenge.
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Based on these assumptions that the U.S. has pledged to defend 42 countries from external attack and that we must be ready to fight three wars at once the present military budget is too low. U.S. forces are prepared to meet two types of wars: conventional warfare, where one nation attacks another and counter-insurgency warfare where the U.S. as in Vietnam and Laos, adds a government in putting down a revolutionary challenge.

The United States has made commitments to 42 countries to defend them against outside aggression. Except in one or two cases, the interests of the American people in these commitments has never been publicly debated. They were all undertaken years ago under radically different circumstances.

Based on these assumptions that the U.S. has pledged to defend 42 countries from external attack and that we must be ready to fight three wars at once the present military budget is too low. U.S. forces are prepared to meet two types of wars: conventional warfare, where one nation attacks another and counter-insurgency warfare where the U.S. as in Vietnam and Laos, adds a government in putting down a revolutionary challenge.

The United States has made commitments to 42 countries to defend them against outside aggression. Except in one or two cases, the interests of the American people in these commitments has never been publicly debated. They were all undertaken years ago under radically different circumstances.

Based on these assumptions that the U.S. has pledged to defend 42 countries from external attack and that we must be ready to fight three wars at once the present military budget is too low. U.S. forces are prepared to meet two types of wars: conventional warfare, where one nation attacks another and counter-insurgency warfare where the U.S. as in Vietnam and Laos, adds a government in putting down a revolutionary challenge.

The United States has made commitments to 42 countries to defend them against outside aggression. Except in one or two cases, the interests of the American people in these commitments has never been publicly debated. They were all undertaken years ago under radically different circumstances.

Based on these assumptions that the U.S. has pledged to defend 42 countries from external attack and that we must be ready to fight three wars at once the present military budget is too low. U.S. forces are prepared to meet two types of wars: conventional warfare, where one nation attacks another and counter-insurgency warfare where the U.S. as in Vietnam and Laos, adds a government in putting down a revolutionary challenge.

The United States has made commitments to 42 countries to defend them against outside aggression. Except in one or two cases, the interests of the American people in these commitments has never been publicly debated. They were all undertaken years ago under radically different circumstances.

Based on these assumptions that the U.S. has pledged to defend 42 countries from external attack and that we must be ready to fight three wars at once the present military budget is too low. U.S. forces are prepared to meet two types of wars: conventional warfare, where one nation attacks another and counter-insurgency warfare where the U.S. as in Vietnam and Laos, adds a government in putting down a revolutionary challenge.

The United States has made commitments to 42 countries to defend them against outside aggression. Except in one or two cases, the interests of the American people in these commitments has never been publicly debated. They were all undertaken years ago under radically different circumstances.
Although it strikes me as well adapted, thoroughly organized, neat, clean, and non-political—pretty much like an ant hill.

Perhaps that's the basic philosophical problem of Earth Day, at least for the select few who share my moral and social predictions. How do we reconcile the central dogma of liberation "There is no ultimate goal so valuable that all men should devote their freedom to achieving it" with the kind of submissiveness to central authority and single-minded scientific planning that the new bio-politicians seem to require?

At least philosophers should know that nobody has a corner on wisdom. There's no particular reason to be swatstruck by a biologist who says, "In the long run, voluntarism (concerning protection) is insanity. The result will be continued uncontrolled population growth." Not by one who thinks, "Two people cause much more than twice as much damage to the environment as one person." Counter examples are not hard to come by. There is evidence that affluent American women, completing their childbearing years since 1964, have voluntarily had fewer children than the 2.13 required to replace the parental couple, given current mortality rates. There is also reason to believe that two people cause more than twice as effective as one in combating pollution, if they want to.

True, this is an argument against Zero Population Growth—it is simply a skeptical slant on a new cult and its disciples. The population will approach, and perhaps exceed the world's problems has the allure of all non-manageable solutions. But we really want the agents of an international C.I.A. putting contraceptive chemicals in the Chinese water supply? It would be nicer than nuclear or overt C & B warfare, I know. And I do believe in cutting your losses. But this approach also has the seductive appeal of a minimal investment of resources and of indifference that we should spend tens of billions on (continued on page 9)

**The environment and politics**

Edward Manier

**The last two years has seen the emergence of the environment as a major issue of major proportions. From the bitterly divisive issues of the sixties, the war, poverty, civil rights, we move into a new and different age in which Richard Nixon and Abbie Hoffman stand opposed to defend the environment against pollution. The prospects are startling. In 1976 America might achieve the first time in which the pollution and government. Sporadic Agnew is President, Morton Mitchell is vice-president (having won the liberal vote by requesting the New York Times to "crucify" pollutants.) John Schön is appointed to a new cabinet position, Secretary in charge of Radical Environmental Concern.

In summary, there are serious questions which must be asked of the political and environmental movements over our environment. In this brief article I will simply attempt to raise some of these questions.

First, we must consider the mass character of the present movement. Admittedly the enormous grass roots involvement in both grassy and frutitary moves to govern and action. The problem, as in most democracies, is that information and understanding is unevenly distributed across the population. This coupled with the fact that pollution controls involve so many important economic and environmental standards, the specter of popular demands which cannot be translated into reasonable legislation. The example of the ABM issue is instructive. Grass roots pressure was the driving force, but because of our understanding of the issue much of the protest was uncompromising (i.e. by moving sites away from cities). Similar problems will certainly arise with respect to pollution. For example, what is an acceptable definition of "clean" water and air? What should be the trade-off between incremental removal of pollutants and sharply rising costs.

It would seem that at some point leadership must emerge which can remain consistent with grassroots demands and yet have the leverage to translate demands into workable legislation. Events such as the toilets can help considerably in the qualified technical people must take a lead in articulating the issues in such a way that meaningful debate can take place. Our democracy is plagued with the demand, demands of technical competence, and mass participation in decision-making. At some point the environment movement must balance off these demands.

Second, we must consider the question of priorities. The sarcasm of the opening paragraph was not entirely in jest. There is some change that concern over the environment will preempt other issues which perhaps must justly call for our attention. Inflation, poverty, foreign involvements, all these are issues which remain uncouned. I would contend that there is no need to slacken efforts in these areas. Enough resources are available to us and can only demand more in the name of "progress." We have seen a long and painful period of political and environmental activism. Should we or the editor of "Philosophy precedes ecology." We need a new political philosophy...
An observer's reflection on Earth Day

James Rakowski

It seems to me that we should face the fact that we live for the most part in an artificial, controlled environment and not a natural environment. And I wish to suggest that we not overemphasize the value of an untainted natural environment.

I wonder how many of my readers can say as they read these lines from which direction the wind is blowing outside. Someone who truly lived in a natural environment, say a sailor or a hunter, would be as aware of this as we are of the day of the week.

On the other hand there are in nature many things of beauty which we value highly, but not inestimably. And it is also true that we have introduced into our environment many hazards, some of them not fully understood, which we would prefer to be free of, but not at any cost however high. I am not convinced that people who are unwilling to pay the nuisance cost of fastening their automobile seat belts will or should collectively be willing to bear large costs to purge the environment of any trace of potentially hazardous pollutants.

And it is certainly true that many of our essential natural resources are becoming scarcer. But the economist, trained to think in terms of allocating scarce resources to competing needs, is not alarmed by this availability. Our society has developed tolerably workable ways of rationing our scarce goods. Thus, for example, salt is scarce, but we find that a sufficiently high price on salt will allocate the salt available to roughly its most valuable uses. Now that we perceive that pure water, for example, is a scarce commodity, we must be about the task of rationing it. It is hardly necessary to point out that considerations on the pollution of water for industrial purposes, we do not forbid the industrial use of salt. On the other hand we do forbid salt to industry for free, and we should not allow industry to appropriate for itself our water resources. Many firms, when forced to pay for the resources they use, will be forced to raise the prices of their products. But, if the charge for industrial use of water is set rationally, (continued on page 6)

Population and Pollution:

Richard LaManna

The recently aroused public concern with the quality of the physical environment is a long overdue development that hopefully will lead to a reevaluation of the way we use and misuse our natural resources. It is unfortunate that the discussion to date has been so dominated by people whose ideological commitments and emotional involvements seem to take precedence over their scientific objectivity and respect for facts. In their eagerness to promote their cause they have frequently misrepresented, and grossly misunderstood the problems they have discussed. I do not wish to engage in polemics but I do feel it is important to call public attention to some of these issues if the real problems are to be dealt with intelligently and reasonably.
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Population and Pollution:

Richard LaManna

The recently aroused public concern with the quality of the physical environment is a long overdue development that hopefully will lead to a reevaluation of the way we use and misuse our natural resources. It is unfortunate that the discussion to date has been so dominated by people whose ideological commitments and emotional involvements seem to take precedence over their scientific objectivity and respect for facts. In their eagerness to promote their cause they have frequently misrepresented, and grossly misunderstood the problems they have discussed. I do not wish to engage in polemics but I do feel it is important to call public attention to some of these issues if the real problems are to be dealt with intelligently and reasonably.

How

First, lets take the fashionable notion that virtually every social and physical ill of the society is a result of population growth. Paul Ehrlich, for example, claims that everything from garbage in the environment to rising crime rates and riots are "caused" by "growing population." He said an oversimplification of the relationship of population growth to social problems would be laughable if it were not that it is taken seriously by a lot of people. Ehrlich's lack of sophistication as regards social problems is easier to understand than observations on the effects of ecologically faulty technology. Barry Commoner in the Saturday Review (4/14/70) notes that nearly all the stresses that have caused the current environmental crisis—smog, detergents, insecticides, heavy use of fertilizers, radiation—began but 20 to 25 years ago. That period saw a sharp rise in the per capita production of pollution. In the mid-1960s the total utilization of fertilizer increased about 700%, electric power generation went up by about 500%. In that period the U.S. population increased by only 4.5%. Commoner notes "the increasing proportion of those responsible for increasing pollution in the United States is not the increased number of people, but the intensified effects of ecologically faulty technology on the environment." He would appear then that biologists like Ehrlich might better spend their time examining questions like why we come to accept so widely these new products; what can be done to protect the public from a recurrance of these disasters? What alternative products can be developed that would have the desirable but the undesirable effects of these innovations?, rather than how to attain a zero population growth, a subject on which they do not appear to be too well informed. Ehrlich's organization AZP advocated limiting families to two children in order to "achieve a stationary population but even a demographer can tell you that a two child limit would not result in a stationary population but a declining population. Only if each family had less than one child per completed family is required for replacement. If we decide that these advocates have seriously considered all the consequences of creating a stationary population. A stationary population with an expectation of life of 80 years would be a disaster. It would mean that nearly all the stresses that have caused the current environmental crisis—smog, detergents, insecticides, heavy use of fertilizers, radiation—began but 20 to 25 years ago. That period saw a sharp rise...."
Idiocracies on population and pollution

Donald Barrett

Professor Barrett is a member of the department of sociology. His special concern is the population explosion and what can be done to curb it.

In case you didn't know, you are polluting the earth by your mere presence. Further, if you plan to have any children, you are guilty of high crimes against the "laws of nature." And not only is the new-born baby the target of assault, but population growth generally is allegedly the cause of the abuse and destruction of our planet. Consequently, you rational beings become the only unintelligent animals on the face of the earth.

Such are the ideological conclusions and arguments now swirling the urgent concern and needed pretenses about abuses of the environment. It seems important to list conclusions first, and arguments and evidence later, because facts and demographic scientific analyses tend to be selected and shunted to back up such conclusions.

But note clearly that the issue here is not that rapid population change and environmental destruction are unconnect-ed. They are connected, as can be shown later. And the basic question should be framed in terms of the quality of the arguments. No educated man should accept purported "facts" and lines of reasoning without demanding proof. Significant portions of the citations of "experts," especially where such "experts" have inverse their field of expertise. Mr. Finch of HEW, for example, appears to think that birth control is THE answer to all problems, the growth of the economy, inflation, poverty, the ghetto, abnormally inadequate schools in slums, foreign aid and everything else.

Special caution must be attached to accepting the interpretations of the "technician-become-humanist." Anyone, including the demographer, the medical doctor, the engineer, the ecologist can and should be concerned about human values and the human condition. But such an expert can more readily overlook the uncritical citizen with strident, abstruse data to prove "a conclusion without consideration of values outside his specialty. Leadership given to specialists, that becomes hazardous to the full round of societal values. Just such an expert is a part of the human and social values that we make a set of postpartum generals subject to a president (hopefully), a non-specialist, who must submit to constant national judgement. On these grounds it would be vital in the present controversy to listen also to social philosophers and political scientists concerned with the freedom so hard-won in the history of mankind.

Technicians in good conscience would often rather run poll-nell toward authoritarian programs which would force "ignorant" and "stupid" people to an end in the new hopel, regardless of consequences.

Is Population Explosion the Issue?

There certainly has been and continues to be a population explosion. We are all familiar with the growth of populations doubling, since 1800, in 100, 200, and in 30, and in less than 30 years. Let us then retrace the steps however. A dismantling of the arguments. No educated man may allow himself to be swayed by bad data to "prove" a conclusion.

Must we experience economic and social catastrophe, widespread starvation and premature death, before they develop effective birth control methods?

The extremest argument that population growth in the United States poses such a threat that earth-abuse is an inevitable consequence. Hardly if the apocalypse (last part of proposition) were caused by population growth, then an appropriate explanation is that we are neglecting the excess deaths and too many immigrants each year. Why? The facts show, 1) the lowest crude birth rate (over the last 3 years) in the history of the country, 2) the depression data that the growth is 17(5 per 1,000 mid-year-pollu-duction; 2) the death rate has risen to a low level since 1950(95.1 per 1,000) and thus more people survive to older ages than ever before. Therefore our net civilian immigration rate has moved upward since World War II (204,633 to 21,948,400, net immigrants). A more refined birth rate, the GFR (General Fertility Rate, i.e. number of births per 1,000 women 15-44 yrs.) has been falling radically since 1959, 86,2 in 1960, to 78.6 in 1969 — unquestionably largely due to "the pill." The birth rate broken into 5-year age cohorts shows that: 1) older women, 35-39, have the highest fertility and will still be coming out of the fecundity years, and 2) younger women, 20-24, have much lower rates. Note that the median age of the woman at her first birth is about 21-22 yrs. and at her last birth is about 25-26 — the continues of fertility time gives great meaning to the lower GFR of 20-24 year olds. Finally, we may mention that the Catholic birth rate has been declining quickly since 1962 (the pill) and even the 134,000 baptisms (total number) have declined considerably.

Connections: Population and Pollution

In this connection this connection can be adumbrated in a number of ways, but space in this essay forces limitations. Urbanization is one connection. Clearly the primary reasons for the recent and spectacular migration to the cities are to be found in the extensive and rigorous commercialization of agriculture, its attendant technological (machines, pesticides) evolution, and the need for economically depressed rural peoples (rural non-farm too) to flood the city in search of jobs in industry, trade and services.

Historically it is important to notice there is no "natural" or possibly necessary connection between rapid urban expansion and earth-abuse. The Netherlands and The Caribbean countries shows otherwise. County govern-ment in rural areas has tended to be burdened with rapid population growth, larger, more powerful commercial farm-enterprises, simply without regard for growth, and misery, if not flooding the city in search of jobs in industry, trade and services. City also. Suburban peoples resist moves around the suburbs and the invasion of poorer, less well-off neighborhoods. They aim to achieve diversification of the economy, and through community government, in central urban districts, achieve pollution and misuse the land, social catastrophy, widespread starvation and poverty, the ghetto, the slum, and the cancerous growth of the urban core. The so-called "flight" of wealthier peoples to the suburbs and the invasion of poorer, less economically developed countries which have had the time and resources to develop. The extreme argument is that our economic growth depends on the destruction of the earth. We expect the rural scene to look and act like the city. "We expect the rural scene to look and act like the city.

The environment and politics

(continued from page 5)

Deal put bread on the table. But it also paved the way for some of our present turmoil by failing to articulate what in principle was to be just for the society. Ad Hoc improvements in civil rights during the 40's and 50's improved conditions for some, but precured the violence of the 60's by failing to announce in word and deed a'standard of real equality. The radical movement at present is probably right in most of its critique of evils in American society, but again fails to answer the most crucial political question: "What, in fact, are we fighting for?" Much of the active concern about the environment is the too clearly right in most of its protest. Such are the ideological conclusions and arguments now swirling the urgent concern and needed pretenses about abuses of the environment. It seems important to list conclusions first, and arguments and evidence later, because facts and demographic scientific analyses tend to be selected and shunted to back up such conclusions.

But note clearly that the issue here is not that rapid population change and environmental destruction are unconnect-ed. They are connected, as can be shown later. And the basic question should be framed in terms of the quality of the arguments. No educated man may allow himself to be swayed by bad data to "prove" a conclusion.

Must we experience economic and social catastrophe, widespread starvation and premature death, before they develop effective birth control methods?

The extremest argument that population growth in the United States poses such a threat that earth-abuse is an inevitable consequence. Hardly if the apocalypse (last part of proposition) were caused by population growth, then an appropriate explanation is that we are neglecting the excess deaths and too many immigrants each year. Why? The facts show, 1) the lowest crude birth rate (over the last 3 years) in the history of the country, 2) the depression data that the growth is 17(5 per 1,000 mid-year-pollu-duction; 2) the death rate has risen to a low level since 1950(95.1 per 1,000) and thus more people survive to older ages than ever before. Therefore our net civilian immigration rate has moved upward since World War II (204,633 to 21,948,400, net immigrants). A more refined birth rate, the GFR (General Fertility Rate, i.e. number of births per 1,000 women 15-44 yrs.) has been falling radically since 1959, 86,2 in 1960, to 78.6 in 1969 — unquestionably largely due to "the pill." The birth rate broken into 5-year age cohorts shows that: 1) older women, 35-39, have the highest fertility and will still be coming out of the fecundity years, and 2) younger women, 20-24, have much lower rates. Note that the median age of the woman at her first birth is about 21-22 yrs. and at her last birth is about 25-26 — the continues of fertility time gives great meaning to the lower GFR of 20-24 year olds. Finally, we may mention that the Catholic birth rate has been declining quickly since 1962 (the pill) and even the 134,000 baptisms (total number) have declined considerably.

Connections: Population and Pollution

In this connection this connection can be adumbrated in a number of ways, but space in this essay forces limitations. Urbanization is one connection. Clearly the primary reasons for the recent and spectacular migration to the cities are to be found in the extensive and rigorous commercialization of agriculture, its attendant technological (machines, pesticides) evolution, and the need for economically depressed rural peoples (rural non-farm too) to flood the city in search of jobs in industry, trade and services. City also. Suburban peoples resist moves around the suburbs and the invasion of poorer, less well-off neighborhoods. They aim to achieve diversification of the economy, and through community government, in central urban districts, achieve pollution and misuse the land, social catastrophy, widespread starvation and poverty, the ghetto, the slum, and the cancerous growth of the urban core. The so-called "flight" of wealthier peoples to the suburbs and the invasion of poorer, less economically developed countries which have had the time and resources to develop. The extreme argument is that our economic growth depends on the destruction of the earth. We expect the rural scene to look and act like the city. "We expect the rural scene to look and act like the city. ...
An ecology week special

The ethics of population and pollution

Stanley Hauerwas

Professor Hauerwas teaches ethics at Augustana College in Rock Island, Illinois and will be visiting here this fall teaching a course in Christian ethics. This paper was written primarily for presentation in the form of a talk, rather than for publication, and as such the writer considers it a first draft.

For many today the only ethical question involved in the population-pollution issue is what is the most efficient means to stop the rapid growth of the world's population. Once the issue is put in this stark way, however, the natural reaction of many is one of shock and then a determined resolve that something must be done about the coming crisis. The primary assumption often behind this response is that survival is the one value concerned. It is a corollary of this assumption that any means can be justified in this situation in order to achieve the end of reduced population growth.

For example there are only two ways to reduce population growth: reduce the birth rate or decrease the death rate. Most of those who assume that survival is the one value presuppose that the death rate must be decreased by some means to allow the population to increase. It is also often assumed that it is appropriate to use certain techniques to increase the birth rate. However, there are often also assume that it is appropriate to use certain techniques to increase the death rate. They are for example, impregnated by the statistic that shows the most frequent cause of death to be a sudden and dramatic drop in the birth rate is to resort to widespread abortion (and abortion is, of course, the increase strategy, it is not birth control).

In such a context abortion is simply viewed as a means to a morally good end - no longer is the question of abortion concern for itself; the question of the viability of the fetus is often considered as an issue in itself, the question of survival is the one value concerned. As soon as such questions are raised it becomes clear that the moral issues in the population-pollution crises are more complex than simply the question of survival - that is, they are more complex if we are interested in surviving as fully human beings - otherwise we may simply be willing to survive at a cost of employing measures that would make us less than human. It is to recognize that human life is not an end in itself if it is divorced from the more complex values that make life worthwhile.

Often when someone raises these kinds of questions that challenge the reigning orthodoxy surrounding the population issue the questioner is accused of being more concerned with the quality of life than the quantity. For example Robert Andrey is a recent Life article says, "The humanness preoccupation with 'quality of life' has been offset by the recognition of the viability of the fetus. All this is clear the logic of the position. But it must also be pointed out that contrary to Andrey's assertion it is those who adhere to the utilitarian argument that are concerned with the numbers game as they assume that all men can be treated as strict numerical entities to be added and subtracted like inorganic units. It is not merely an issue of quantity versus quality, but rather differing interpretations of the quality of life.

In this connection I must admit that I am a bit of a liberal who understand "quality of life" that take up the population issue in this country. For I sometimes think that they are more concerned with preserving a certain kind of middle class standard of living than moral quality. This is probably an overstatement but we must be on our guard not to use the population issue as a pretext for our own self-interest. In this respect it is interesting to note that some black Americans are extremely suspicious of the population argument as they perceive it as a possible attempt at genocide. Moreover, much of the third world views the attempts to regulate their birth rate as but a different form of Western imperialism.

Population, Self-Determination and Community

In the light of these considerations I should like to suggest that the moral issues raised by the population-pollution crises are best understood in relation to the dialectical values of self-determination and community. By self-determination I do not mean, rather differing interpretations of the quality of life.
The ethics of population and pollution

Population and pollution: some neglected considerations

Pollution control, the war on poverty, and the improvement of our educational system, if we can achieve the same effect by spending millions on population control.

Let me insist that I thoroughly agree with Rene Dubos that, “We human beings exist and enjoy life only by virtue of the conditions created and maintained on the surface of the earth by the microbes, plants, and animals that have converted its massmate matter into a highly integrated living structure. Any profound disturbance in the ecological balance, for example, is a threat to the maintenance of human life as we know it now.” But man’s social organization is an essential component of that ecological equilibrium. We can be sure that if man adopts the social organization of the ant hill he will obliterate that distinctive ecological niche which de­

The central issue I think both are calling forth is the question of population, for both force us to ask if we can be held accountable for our creativity of its inhabitant.

Ecology for liberals

unquestioned certainty is in sharp contrast to the view of careful students of the subject like British environmentalist Stanley Johnson who worked on the consequences of over-population. Johnson with his close observation of this phenomenon over the year that “I have been astonished at the remarkable savings of opinion which occur from month to month as serious work on new agricultural prospects for the next ten, twenty, or thirty years are under way, and to winters of starvation, of a general demographic crisis, and this human significance. Because we are self-determining we are able to form our lives in accordance with our perceptions of good and right, which provides the basis for our assumption that we can be held accountable for our beliefs, choices and actions.

Thus the population-pollution crisis does raise serious moral questions, but it is not alone the question of survival, but rather it is the question of what kind of human communities do we want to

On campus, big oil’s offshore drilling, a $250 million supermarket, food scarcity; the problem of population control has brought to you by the 1985 Provisional Indicative Plan of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment.

I want to note one other point: virtually disposes of the possibility that we can all go back and feed itself. “The battle to feed all of humanity is over and our claims. Some time between 1970 and 1985 the world will undergo vast famine and suffering. Hundreds of millions of people are going to starve to death. However, the American Food and Agricultural Organization’s “ Provisional Indicative Plan for Agricultural Development” presents a strategy whereby the food/pollution expansion would be possible for all the world to maintain its present high “nutriceous” rice’habilities and problems of over-pollution of rice in South East Asia. Ehrlich’s

What are the lessons we need to understand and what are the lessons that we need to learn to limit it for the common good, a good that is satisfied by the sum of our satisfactions, then we may all have to live with the consequences of our actions.

We can be receptive to change, and indeed would be in the expectation of advancement in authority and this human significance. Because we are self-determining we are able to form our lives in accordance with our perceptions of good and right, which provides the basis for our assumption that we can be held accountable for our beliefs, choices and actions.

This aspect of our moral being is institutionalized and concretely determined the question of population control has brought to you by the 1985 Provisional Indicative Plan of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment.

When philosophers work between established, professional disciplines, they just can’t make any contribution.

Discussions, teach-ins, and slogans, useful as they are, can be at a peak for the foreseeable future as long as we must learn to limit our population growth to a stop just as the cure may be more disastrous than the disease.

The ethics of population and pollution
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population is the best choice today.” (Population Index Oct-Dec. 1968).

One final word for Paul Ehrlich and company. It’s just a flat cop-out to say that population control is stupid, that a biologist can address with scientific expertise, but that price, wage, and governmental control are outside the “field of competence.”

I suppose that’s why relatively few philosophers claim to be wise men or prophets these days. At least we know what the territorial line is, and so’s it going to take considerable ingenuity to prevent major polluters from passing off the cost of the day reckoning brought on by years of exploitation right on to the consumer — the same profit envy which is selling pollution control devices on the side.

Few philosophers since Thales con­

The population-pollution crisis does raise serious moral questions, but it is not alone the question of survival, but rather it is the question of what kind of human communities do we want to

Ehrlich’s

Our morality is just as pluralistic as good liberalism.

Neither good ecologists nor good liberals can be content with the present state of affairs. Michigan and condone black children, to summer in mowing, to fish, to vote, and to winters with underpaid teachers who hate their jobs. Neither good ecologists nor good liberals can be content if we can take the easy route of trying to solve our problems by replacing injustice and evil with social productivity, but to voters with working for major polluters who hate their jobs and with underpaid teachers who hate their jobs.

The ethics of population and pollution
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mean just the possibility that men have to determine their futures through their beliefs, intentions and choices. Such abil­

ity is of course a prerequisite for the value of self-determination, but it is not the normative principle. Nowhere does self-determination embody those aspects of our moral existence that allows us to determine, rather than be determined by, the natural. This is the reason that the value of self-determination is so basic in any consideration of human behavior. It is the aspect that guarantees the human possibility of human creativity and free­

doctrine to the question of population, for this problem is forcing us to see that in reality, not just in ideology, we are in a community with one another. We are in America cannot morally afford to ignore this as a problem for all the world for we are bound on an ecological road to work, to live and to winters of starvation, of a general demographic crisis, and this human significance. Because we are self-determining we are able to form our lives in accordance with our perceptions of good and right, which provides the basis for our assumption that we can be held accountable for our beliefs, choices and actions.

The value of self-determination is re­

lated to many different kinds of our understandings of human behavior. For example, it is the primary value underlying the personal notions of kinship, kin selection, and propagation. As human beings we think that we claim certain rights in regard to each other as opponents in debate, and not as partners in a co-operative enterprise. The central issue I think both are calling forth is the question of population, for both force us to ask if we can be held accountable for our creativity of its inhabitant.

Each human life is the product of self-determination and this human significance. Because we are self-determining we are able to form our lives in accordance with our perceptions of good and right, which provides the basis for our assumption that we can be held accountable for our beliefs, choices and actions.

The central issue I think both are calling forth is the question of population, for both force us to ask if we can be held accountable for our creativity of its inhabitant.

This is even more the case in respect to the question of population, for this problem is forcing us to see that in reality, not just in ideology, we are in a community with one another. We are in
The Constitutional Revision Committee, meeting last night, had on the agenda the third time, debate on constitutional revisions, due to the absence of three of the four Hall Presidents on the committee.

Hunter, former Senator from Bren-Phillips and Stay Senator, who resigned last October, said that until the past three years, he had not taken an attempt to create student interest in student government by artificial means. He labelled the proposed Forum as such an attempt.

Hunter also argued that, “You’re removing your hall President from his natural constituency.” He said that Hall Presidents should be elected on the basis of hall issues, not campus-wide issues that are currently dealt with by the senators.

For example, he said, no hall President from Flanner should be elected on the basis of what he thinks of black concentrations in Dillon. He claimed that this would be the state of affairs should the Committee approve the Forum, and in effect, he said, each Hall President from Flanner should be elected on the basis of what he thinks of black concentrations in Dillon.

Finally, Hunter addressed himself to the question of Dave Krashna’s election being a “mandate” for the Forum as proposed in the election campaign. He contended that the election was a mandate to “get the students interested.” He also cited the placing of a Hall Presidents Council member in the SBP Cabinet as a possible method to get student government back to the halls.

Hunter also argued that, “To change the structure does not necessarily mean to get respect... The way to get respect is to produce. The primary responsibility of any hall body, no matter what you call it, is to produce. You’ll get respect.”

He argued, “To change the structure does not necessarily mean to get respect... The way to get respect is to produce. The primary responsibility of any hall body, no matter what you call it, is to produce. You’ll get respect.”

After Hunter’s speech, SBP Dave Krashna countered some of his arguments. First, he stated the past SBP was not ineffective. Second, he questioned the research value of the Senate, since he said Cabinet members could do this.

He stated that maybe the Senate is more effective in certain situations. He also defended the Forum as an enabling the Hall Presidents to bring back the “feelings of the Hall.”

As for the “mandate” issue, Krashna said he wanted emphasis to be placed on the halls, and there’s the rationale behind the Forum.

To these arguments, Hunter countered that the Senate would be elected people doing research, and the University does not necessarily mean to get respect... The way to get respect is to produce. The primary responsibility of any hall body, no matter what you call it, is to produce. You’ll get respect.”

You only go around once in life. So grab for all the gusto you can. Even in the beer you drink. Why settle for less?

When you’re out of Schlitz, you’re out of beer.
Earth Day across USA

(UPI) — Hundreds of thousands of Americans took part Wednesday in demonstrations for a cause affecting the lives of every one of them—keeping the earth livable.

It was Earth Day, an occasion for Americans of all shades of belief to determine to stop the spreading pollution of the earth, the water and atmosphere which some scientists have warned, threatens the very existence of life on this planet.

Congress was closed down while senators and representatives spread across the country to address mass rallies. Thousands of college, universities and high schools took an active part, with the gas burning automobile a major target of attack on many campuses. Students blocked the four main gates of Syracuse University and manned barricades at Iowa State University to keep cars out.

New York led the nation's cities in demonstrating mounting concern over the threat of pollution. The city's Union Square was made spotless by about 300 persons, aged 8 to 80, who showed up at dawn. Then an estimated 250,000 persons converged on the square to listen to speeches, watch a stage show, and stroll on 14th Street, which was closed to traffic.

Gas masks were sold out in Omaha, Neb., because students throughout the city chose to observe the day by wearing them.

Black athletes tell their dissatisfaction

(continued from page 1)

2) decreasing the amount administered to them while they cease their use for tuition and every other thing with a price tag attached to it; 3) intensifying this indifference by changing the price tag attached to it; 4) giving him a job that entails too much responsibility, i.e., loaning him to death; 5) putting the black student into the place to live. Population growth is not some underdeveloped countries. It may be that more coercive techniques are necessary in such situations, but if so they must be justified in terms of the common good. Such coercive strategies should be used as much as possible to enhance human freedom and encourage responsible community behavior. For it may well be that survival is the question at stake but let us make sure we survive as human beings that is as men who are free to determine themselves in accordance with the need of the other.

Some people believe that the figures that are projected for the Black Studies Program are disillusioning because the financial aid given to students is so small and it shouldn't be. Being black, it is important for me to know what's going to affect me in the future and what's going to happen to me if I'm not the best. I feel that the administration and those who have set up this program should work in some way to make all the black students aware of what is going on.

DeWitt Fleming, Minister of the Church for the Afro-American society added, "We've gone to Brother Kiernan Ryan twice first with our grievances about financial aid and the other time with the proposals which we asked for as a solution for the alleviation of our financial burdens. Presently we are giving him the runaround and it's been a real bother to me."

The text mentions several problems faced by black students in terms of financial aid and the need for the university to address these issues.
Improving netmen up their record

by Jack Schaefter

THE OBSERVER

The Notre Dame varsity tennis team upped its season record to 8–2 by winning two out of three matches against Ohio State and Penn State which were played over the past three days. Despite the fact that this was perhaps the most grueling part of the schedule the Irish did not fall victim to their adversary chances for an exceptionally fine year.

The brightest aspect of the last three matches has to be the improvement and sparkling play at the number two doubles position by Bernie LeSeage.

The junior, who received a letterman from Pasadena, California, has really started to put his game together in winning back to back singles matches against Michigan and Michigan State.

Coach Tom Fallon has given him a couple of days rest before their next match against powerhouse Indiana at home Tuesday. The Irish played Indiana over the Easter holidays down in Washington D.C. at the Cherry Blossom Tournament.

The Irish have improved over the past three weeks making them a definite threat to upset the talented Hoosiers.

Monday, April 20, ND 59, Toledo 39

One singles player Baxter Brown got the Irish victory in a tough three victory. Mike Reilly (no. 3), gil Theissen (no. 4), and co-captain Bob O'Mally (no.6), followed suit with singles victories to move the Irish to within one point of victory. The third doubles team of Greg Murray and Bob Schaefter proved the clinching point. Each team was awarded a half point when the second doubles team of Bernie LeSeage and Mike Reilly was deadlocked in the first set at 15–15 and darkness started to fall.

Tuesday, April 21, Michigan 6 ND 3 at Ann Arbor.

Despite the fact that they lost to Michigan 6–3, there is no good account of themselves. Michigan brought to the court against college teams, yet ND needed only a few points in some critical situations around the fifth place on. Bernie LeSeage might have different.

The golf team improved its standing in the Big Ten by placing second out of four at Ball State's Invitational Saturday securing their fifth place in the 15 team tournament at Miami of Ohio University.

Bob Wilson fired a 69 at Muncie's Greenhills Country Club securing his third place in the champion Ball State's tourney, making him ND's low man with 141. Close behind were Bob Battaglia with 149, Marty Best and Jim Dunn with 153, and Bill Cevergos and Mike LaFrance with 154.

Monday's tourney was played in heavy rain and winds up to 50 miles an hour making an already difficult 7370 yard course (Heaton Woods in Oxford, Ohio) even rougher. Indiana won, totaling 770 strokes, with Big Ten counterparts Ohio State and Michigan State close behind.
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