

# THEY SCALP SHEEP



• 5¢ for the truth •  
VOL I NO. 37 MARCH II.

ORIGINAL COPY BLANK

### Scab Sheet Editor Speaks...

This issue of the Scab Sheet features a cover "cartoon" depicting members of the newly-formed Commission on Human Rights and Responsibilities as Ku Klux Klan moguls, picking up their hoods enroute to a meeting of the Commission. The drawing is a graphic indication of my feelings, some 14 hours ago, toward individuals who I felt were continuing to disregard human and student rights even while striving to affirm them--i.e., I and a number of other persons are incensed that the President named student members of the Commission without referring that decision to the proper group, the OSU student body.

Those were my feelings some 14 hours ago--it is now 4 a. m.--when I told the Scab Sheet artist what I wanted on the cover. Those are not my feelings now.

My feelings now are that the Scab Sheet cover today is an affront to the President of this University, to each and every member of the Commission, and to myself. It is a violation of the integrity this publication has maintained during a very trying time, and as such it cannot be allowed to pass unexclaimed.

There are circumstances which mitigate, but do not excuse, my action. They are physical near-exhaustion, continued frustration of efforts to wring from this University a clear statement on human rights, and a psychological fatigue giving free rein to emotion instead of personal integrity and political acumen. As far as I can see, each of the parties to the present controversy has succumbed to these pressures at one time or another during the past two weeks, to greater or lesser degrees.

My sense of urgency to see justice done in the present case is surpassed only by my desire to maintain my own, and the newspaper's, integrity. Today's cover artwork is clearly a violation of that sense of integrity, and as such calls for an unequivocal apology to those affected by it personally, and to those who buy the Scab Sheet to get the truth for a nickel.

The cover of this issue of the Scab Sheet can be excused by no means; we may only comment on it as a graphic example of human failing in a time of stress. The sad fact is that our cover exists as a manifestation of our fundamental good will toward the students, faculty and administrators of Oregon State. The sad fact is that for a brief time I was content to let my fundamental good will justify any means to its implementation. The sad fact--as this newspaper has affirmed before, and which I temporarily forgot--is that good will implemented by the wrong means, or simply not implemented at all, loses all semblance of good will.

The front cover of this issue is an example of ruthlessness for which I am responsible; while affirming the political goals and values which it ostensibly supports, I denounce the caricature as reprehensible and of no redeeming worth. In doing so, I ask only that others who have experienced the same loss of proportion be ruthless in demanding the best of themselves, and patient with others who may not sense the dangers in such a loss of integrity.

---The Editor



Phase Two: HRM . . .

Tuesday, March 11, 1969, marks the beginning of the second phase of the human rights movement at Oregon State University. Today the Movement is disassociating itself completely from outmoded and repressive forms of "self-government" by students. Those outmoded forms have for too long given students the appearance of power but not the substance of power . . .

The movement is disassociating itself from a group of student "leaders" which two weeks ago dedicated itself to human rights on this campus, and one week later backed out of that commitment with the claim that it had been tricked into supporting the Administrative proposal.

The Movement is disassociating itself from those persons and groups which conceive of human and student rights as being in some way related to popularity and majority rule. The Movement affirms that human and student rights are not, and cannot, in the words of Prof. Fred Cervantes, "be subject to decision in part or wholly based on popular polls, votes, petitions or opinions. To do this would be to deny the central question or absurdly submit the question of individual rights to the tyranny of majority rule, a move that would be alien to the doctrine of civil and human rights . . ."

That attitude was the one opted for by ASOSU Senate last week when it reneged on its earlier dedication to the BSU position. The Senate at that time claimed that, since the great majority of OSU Students were not in support of the boycott, it could not justifiably endorse it. The Movement will not support any organization whose members conceive of right action simply in terms of majority support . . .

The movement affirms that legitimate authority in such matters rests not in the electorate but in the legitimacy and rightness of the values and goals with which a governing body concerns itself: "The guarantees of civil liberty are but guarantees of the human mind and spirit and of reasonable freedom and opportunity to express them." (Justice Stone of the US Supreme Court, 1939, quoted by Prof. Fred Cervantes in his proposal to arbitrate the BSU-Athletic Department dispute.)

Today the Movement asserts its legitimate authority as a body dedicated to extending students and human rights on the Oregon State University campus. It will promulgate policies and procedures for insuring that students and faculty are accorded their rights as human beings within the University community.

As of this day, there are two student governments on the Oregon State Univ. campus: the impotent and all-but-

worthless ASOSU Senate, and the Human rights movement. To the extent that ASOSU Senate concerns itself in the future with matters to the rights and welfare of each student, the Movement will support it; otherwise Student Senate must be content with small victories in matters of little import to, or impact on, the University community.

The Movement has one notable "success" to point to--the fact that the Administrative Proposal has been adopted as University policy by the Faculty Senate. Regrettably, however, it must be recognized that Faculty Senate adopted the proposal not from any commitment to the principles set down in that document, but simply from disgust at the disregard by football coach Dee Andros for established University channels of authority . . .

The BSU-Athletic Department confrontation raised more issues for discussion by the University community: consideration must now be turned toward a full-scale investigation of the OSU Athletic Department, which has for some time feared such close scrutiny because it will never be able to cover up all the corruption it has sanctioned.

Further, students must move now to secure for themselves real power in matters so basic as naming their peers to positions on student-faculty committees. President Jensen circumlocated student channels with impunity last week in naming three students to the Commission on Human Rights and Responsibilities without consulting student leaders. The Human Rights Movement condemns such action as being destructive not only of student identity within the University structure, but also of student-faculty-administrative dialogue within the academic community.

The Human Rights Movement has been encouraged and gratified during the past two weeks by the receptivity on the part of many faculty members to student efforts vis-a-vis human rights. Their support has been invaluable, and it is to be hoped that they will continue to work with the Human Rights Movement as it addresses itself to other matters of concern to students and faculty.

It is evident that Corvallis is not yet prepared for a free University; our only alternative is now to make this university free. The Human Rights Movement is dedicated to that end.

-----  
From an Associated Press story appearing in the Manhattan, Kansas Mercury of March 9: "Some observers believe the revolt at OSU may be the first of many in college athletic programs."

## Oregonian Sucks . . .

An editorial in the Portland Oregonian of Friday, March 7, is graphic evidence of that newspaper's lack of insight into campus unrest generally and of the Oregon State controversy in particular. Writes the Oregonian agit-prop man:

The best that can be said of the events at OSU in the past week or so is that the protest was non-violent and non-disruptive. If it can now be resolved in the same fashion, with the introduction of reason and good spirit on both sides, it will have served as a valuable lesson in human relations, not just racial relations.

To demonstrate its own dedication to "reason and good spirit," the Oregonian's editorial was accompanied by a cartoon depicting a figure labeled "BSU" drenching itself with gasoline from a can labeled "OSU Withdrawal." Nearby was a book of matches, and the caption read "Self-Immolation."

The cartoon and the general drift of the editorial are indicative of the Oregonian's inability to grasp the importance of the issues raised by the BSU at Oregon State. The editorial continues:

"One may well challenge the proposition that an athletic coach is a proper judge of 'cultural standards.' Certainly Dee Andros' initial action with respect to Fred Milton can be questioned as having no direct relation to Milton's ability to be a member of the Beaver football team. But that small item was permitted to become engraved as the base of protest."

There the Oregonian shows its complete ignorance of the facts as they have developed on the Oregon State campus. If the "small item" of Fred Milton's beard has, in fact, been permitted to become engraved as the base of the protest, that is directly attributable to newspaper accounts coming out of Oregon State.

Journalists are notorious for picking out a simple "angle" for a news story. Fred Milton's beard has always been prominently mentioned in Oregonian news reports, simply because that is an easy way to recap the events leading up to the current conflict. The fact that such recounting is an oversimplification of the issues does not seem to bother the Oregonian editorial department, though.

The campus discussions were indeed touched off by the Milton controversy, and the support given to him by the BSU. Since that time, however, the discourse has centered on the greater issues of human rights and the actions OSU should take to assure them to each and every student in the academic community.

But the Oregonian obviously would prefer to limit the debate to the periferal concerns of the hair on Fred Milton's face. The human rights movement is concerned about Fred Milton's welfare, too, but the primary concern of the movement now is that Oregon State University adopt a statement of human rights which will apply to all students and student-athletes.

## Barometer Exists!

Members of the Scab Sheet staff have waited patiently during the first week of its publication for an admission by the OSU Daily Barometer that the Scab Sheet does, in fact, exist. But the Barometer, as in the past, has preferred to ignore creativity and forthright response to pressing issues: i.e., it has continued to ignore the presence of an underground newspaper in its bailiwick.

Faced with such reticence, the Scab Sheet now takes the burden of dialogue on its own shoulders. We are prepared to state without equivocation that the OSU Daily Barometer in fact does exist; that it is published four times a week on real paper and is distributed free to members of the OSU student body.

The Scab Sheet costs five cents; the difference in cost is one indication of the esteem in which the respective staffs hold their publications. But price is not the only way in which the two papers differ.

The Scab Sheet has been a staunch supporter of the BSU and of human rights--specifically the administrative proposal--throughout the present controversy. Not so the Barometer. It has consistently preferred to compromise the basic issues in favor of a quick irresolution of the conflict.

The Scab Sheet has consistently represented the needs and wishes of a large number of students; its editorial content mirrors the democratic process at work. Not so the Barometer. Its distortion of facts in the news columns can be laid at the feet of its news staff--specifically one individual--who decided to "play down" many of the key issues of the ongoing debate and entirely eliminate others from news coverage.

The Scab Sheet is pleased to recognize the existence of the Barometer, and to request that the editors of that newspaper join us in efforts to spotlight the repressive measures being employed by the administration of this university at all levels. Until the Barometer employs its considerable resources to that end, the Scab Sheet will continue to provide its readers with the truth for a nickel.

## NSA Offers Aid . . .

Incumbent ASOSU student body president John Fraser today received strong endorsement from the National Student Association (NSA) in his efforts in behalf of human rights at OSU.

In a telegram addressed to Fraser, NSA President Robert S. Powell, Jr. said:

"The National Student Association strongly supports your efforts to obtain fairness and justice in the case of Mr. Fred Milton and his arbitrary and childish treatment by the Department of Athletics."

Powell offered the assistance of the NSA in continuing efforts to secure a strong statement by the University community regarding human rights for all students.

## Arkansas blacks Leave . . .

Clarksville, Arkansas (reprinted from Approach, a publication of the Presbyterian Church Board of Missions) -- the Presbyterian Church went full-speed here at midweek (Feb. 24) in attempting to prevent a mass exodus of black students from the College of the Ozarks.

Twenty-one of the college's 36 black students have left the school. A leader said they found harrassment and "in rained racism" on the 560-student campus. The walkout began when two black students were suspended for failing to appear at a meeting of the Dean's Council.

The two suspended black students who triggered the current unrest were members of the college basketball team. One said he was dropped from the team because of his "Afro" hair style. The other left following a dispute with the basketball coach.

James Hood, a leader in the black United front movement, accused college president Dan Davis' administration of threatenin black students with curtailment of scholarships and loans, and of attemptin to "create a stereotype of the black student." Hood said some faculty members were not fair to blacks, and that black students workin at the college were given the most menial jobs available.

Dr. Davis said the accusation about scholarships and loans could not be justified. He said black students often do have menial jobs, but pleaded that "they work beside white students." Davis said the school has only a few skilled jobs in the library and offices and "quite often these (black) students do not have these skills."

In a statement before leaving the campus, Hood said:

"The facade is finally wearin thin. This is supposedly a Christian college. If this is a Christian attitude, there's somethin wrong somewhere. We hope Presbyterians from all over will express their concern to Dr. Davis and the board of Trustees about this.

"We hope that because of our actions of leaving, thin's will change and black students who follow us will not be subjected to harrassment and in rained racism that we have found since we came here."

Lee Ellenwood, chairman of the Student Senate's Student Problems Committee, said the day the black students left was "a day for mourning, for trying to get the undecided black students to stay, and for helping the others pack and meet their buses."

A member of the Presbyterian Board of National Missions recommended a complete chronological study of all incidents leading up to the black exodus, and a written record of all negotiations with students. The board member, Dr. Inelma Adair, also asked for an open channel of communications with students, "immediate employment of a black staff counselor and vigorous recruiting of more black staff for the fall semester," and a "reaffirmation of the role of National Missions colleges as being concerned for the alienated."

## Fraser Steps Down...

(continued from page 2)

What we, as students, must do now is to unite with the concerned faculty of this institution who have proved themselves receptive to student voices. Together we must build an institution in which the human spirit is not repressed, but liberated. We must build an institution which is not so rigid with rules that human rights have no place. We must build an institution in which the governed govern.

To these ends I dedicate myself. I ask all concerned faculty and students to join me.

I believe that my present function as Student Body President can be of no consequence to the Human Rights Movement, which must proceed. Therefore I, John Fraser, President of the Associated Students of Oregon State University, do hereby resign effective March 23, 1969, and disengage myself from Student Government as defined by the Administration, to move into a government of the students, by the students and, most of all, for the students of Oregon State University.

---John Fraser  
March 10, 1969

## Oregon Senate Raps...

The University of Oregon Student Senate has moved to support OSU students in their struggle for human rights.

A resolution adopted by the ASUO:

---Resolved, we strongly censure the position and behavior of coach De Andros.

---Resolved, we also give our support to those many students who stand with Fred Milton in protecting his personal rights.

---Resolved, we recommend that until such time as the situation has been remedied and assurances given that such instances will not occur again, the U of O refuse to participate in athletics with OSU.

OSU Jock Raps,  
Andros Sucks...

(Editor's note: The following open letter to Dee Andros has been submitted to the Scab Sheet by a white member of the OSU football team, who requested that he remain anonymous.)

I am a white member of the OSU football team. It is my respect for the coach, which in the past moved me to action on the field, that now moves my pen upon this page.

Good faith is a laudable curiosity, but which sometimes militates against understanding. It is in good faith that Coach Andros denies discrimination. Wherein lies the irony; for his religious zeal has fortified a tenuous conception into inflexible dogma.

I attended a meeting of the football team of late and learned firsthand the exact position of my coach. He explained that he had never consciously been unfair to any player, black or white, and that he had never been guilty of discrimination. The present controversy, he said, was not racial, but one of discipline applied indiscriminately to all.

The reasons he gave for needing the rule concerning cleanliness were as follows: (1)--For team unity, and (2)--Because he had a responsibility to the athletes and their parents to make them, at least by appearances, to warrant the respect and pride of the community.

He believes that a clean shave is a virtue, and that as such it will warrant the respect of the community. And that respect will foster community pride in the OSU football team. "I want to produce a team that you (meaning the white community) can be proud of," said Dee Andros. Further, he believes that enforcing this discipline upon his athletes will make them respect themselves, hence take pride in themselves and in the team. Therefore he concludes that this rule is desirable.

This effort on Mr. Andros' part to mold the appearances of his charges into respectable norms is laudable, though his right to do so is questionable. But even if we do not consider his right to mold appearances versus an individual's right to self-expression, and instead consider only the merit of his objective, it is clear beyond cavil that he is failing; and ergo his rules should be revised. The rules of logic tell us that for a conclusion to be valid, all the premises must be true, and they are not. His entire argument is based upon the premise that cleanness is a virtue that warrants respect.

But the community that respects cleanness is the white community; the black does not. The self-respect which comes to the white athlete for being clean and the epitome of

the all-white American boy does not come to the black athlete.

You are thus defeating your own purpose, Mr. Andros, when you apply to the black athlete this rule, which is so closely geared to the white community.

It must be because you are acting in good faith that you fail to realize the inequity in your rule. For in following it the white athlete is applauded; and the black athlete is rejected.

No, Mr. Andros, you have never consciously discriminated, but I say that to fail to understand the differential effects of your action is the ignominy of discrimination.

You have promised to learn about the black culture. If you are sincere in this effort and are attentive to your teacher, you will someday know that this is racism, and you are a racist.

---

Student Power Ignored...

OSU President James H. Jensen last Friday came up with yet another show of disdain for student responsibilities and rights in naming the members of his Commission on Human Rights and Responsibilities.

Acting without authority from any official of the ASOSU--and most notably without contacting student body president John Fraser--Dr. Jensen took it upon himself to name three student members of the Commission. Their names: Jim Libby, senior in Engineering; Art Cooper, senior in Pharmacy; and Judy Britton, senior in Education.

The move was a brilliant one on Jensen's part, but is entirely unacceptable from the standpoint of student involvement in attempts to establish the Commission as an authoritative body. The three students are three of the most conservative members, past and present, of ASOSU Senate.

As in the past, the authority to name student members to joint student-faculty committees is vested in the ASOSU President--namely, John Fraser--a supporter of the BSU position and of the Administrative Proposal. The three students named by Jensen have absolutely no authority to sit on the Commission.

Dr. Jensen's attempt to seat them is a crafty attempt to circumlocute established patterns of student participation in university decisions. The three students should refuse to participate in further meetings.