

From a student: "I think all the University does is pass new rules and regulations . . . The University has gotten so big, no one pays any attention to the individual student . . . The administration is run for the benefit of the administration and not for the students or faculty . . ."

From a faculty member: "The students

sult of the age of the institution, traditions have a way of making events and restrictions seem right without further questioning. (I agree with the alumnus who said that school traditions are not desirable; they have a way of strangling robust life by their academic ivy).

3. O.U. is a heterogeneous institution.

student-soon-to-become-alumnus to hold a dislike for the University as a whole. Human inclination sometimes does not allow a differentiation between the parts and the whole.

2. Bad seats or no tickets for an important athletic event can repel friends out of all proportion to the importance of the incident. The fact that the seats or lack of seats is the result of a fair ticket policy is no answer.

3. Faculty members who place themselves in an aloof position from their students and campus visitors can cause irreparable damage. Aloofness is frequently mistaken for superiority, and not just academic superiority.

4. An attitude that exists anywhere within the administration that does not indicate "service" to the individual student proves a lack of interest to the most charitable mind.

5. Strict adherence to rules when an infraction would serve a more worthwhile purpose leaves an indelible impression on the one who bears the consequences.

These are not silly reasons for criticism. They are just and should be heard. They become silly, however, when one incident is allowed to stamp the University with a large red *reject* sign.

Honest criticism rarely does lasting harm and often times a great deal of good. I'm sure that in the 62 years of the University's history, countless critics have levelled countless criticisms at O.U. and the University has continued to grow in academic stature.

A few weeks ago, a friend who holds a large disregard for O.U. asked me why I stayed at the University. The implication was clear that as long as I worked in my present capacity, I was supporting every rule, regulation and policy of the administration.

I too can criticize. But I know something which my friend does not and I know something that many who criticize the University do not consider. The rules and regulations and policies are not the University. Whether or not they are worthy of support is one question. The fact that the University is conceived and is growing into something far greater than any rule or regulation or policy is another. Here education is available for the citizens of Oklahoma if they wish to take advantage of it and education's purpose is worthy of support.

So my answer to my friend was this: "Criticize, if you must, those men and women who populate the University campus. The University as an educational institution is above reproach, unless greatness of purpose is a subject for criticism."

# Under Cover

By DAVID BURR, '52ba

expect too much . . . We can't be all things to all people . . . Someone ought to tell the administration that we are here to teach and not to baby sit . . ."

From an alumnus: "I don't know how they get them, but some of these big companies never seem to have any trouble getting football tickets . . . My son told me last weekend that one of his teachers dropped his grade a whole point for having three cuts . . . I get a parking ticket every time I visit the campus; I'll damned sure never support an institution that insults its visitors . . ."

Variations on these and other themes have been played over and over again. If complaints about the University of Oklahoma were laid end to end, they would circle the globe with more authority than world communism.

Ears do not have to be ultra-sensitive to hear critical comments such as those mentioned above. Since a University is dependent upon public support, it is also a bit thin-skinned to criticism. Frequently the issues are not discussed as fully as they should be—the theory of out-of-sight-out-of-mind prevails.

But there are reasons, very fundamental reasons, why criticism is levelled at O.U. and a statement of them tends to put the matter in its proper perspective.

1. O.U. as an institution of higher learning is in its academic infancy. Rules and regulations, galling restrictions, that arrive with great frequency are the result of meeting a new problem as it arises. The institution has not passed that way before and the rule was not formerly needed. A student body can feel singled out for undue restrictions by remembering that the group that preceded them had no such rule to follow.

2. O.U. has few traditions. A direct re-

No student who has graduated from an Oklahoma high school is turned away from O.U.'s doors. This is as it must be for a state supported school and in many ways a highly desirable situation. However, the very fact that so many different personalities come from so many different environments creates a melting pot that is vigorous, but seldom in agreement.

4. O.U. is the property of a state whose face, until recently, was not attractively presented to sister states. A student from Chicago said recently that her mother was disappointed on a visit to Oklahoma to find no Indians or cowboys in ceremonial attire. Other visitors hold the *Grapes of Wrath* picture firmly in mind. Frequently these misconceptions deceive the out-of-state student and the newly-employed, out-of-state professor, creating some confusion and criticism.

5. O.U. and its family, perhaps similar to other state universities, is fighting the degree versus education battle. Many students and alumni assume that a degree indicates a certain level of education, but, even if it does not, they would prefer to have the degree. They reason: a degree is becoming an economic necessity; an education is not. This approach puts the student at direct odds with the University.

Considering these reasons, it is possible to begin to get a perspective about the University that hasty comments tend to ignore.

The University is after all a very human place operated and attended by very human beings. There is always a possibility for a life-long dislike of the University as a result of two personalities clashing, or of one personality feeling he is being slighted. Consider as examples:

1. A clash between a student and a faculty member may be reason enough for the