

EBERT'S STATEMENTS

1. 11/17 This failure (to keep students informed) is not the fault of either group, but instead should be blamed on the system by which decisions are reached and buildings are authorized at the University.
2. 11/17 Re: Intramural Program ---- it seemed to me ... that it had been made into a means by which fraternities and other organized houses glorified themselves, won trophies, and publicized their names.
3. 11/17 In a personal investigation after my meeting with Mr. Bargh, I satisfied myself that more than half of the students interviewed by Mr. Matthews had not been in favor of the building.
4. 11/17 The University delayed official announcement of the building until a point had been reached at which it was almost impossible to consider whether it should be built. Too much money had already been spent on preliminary plans which would be wasted if the building were cancelled.

THE FACTS

1. The Flow Chart shows very dramatically how the students were kept involved in and informed about the building plans.
2. Only a few houses, fraternity or dormitory, are at the top of the point system at the end of the year, so only a few can use intramural prestige as a means of glorifying themselves. Aren't awards a part of the American way of life? Even Roger Ebert did not turn down the journalism awards which he received and for which recently his name was publicized.
3. A letter was recently sent to each of the interviewed student leaders. Each was asked to sign the following statement: "Let it hereby be known that in the discussion I had with the Intramural Division Administrators concerning the construction of a co-recreation building and the need for a student fee to pay for it, I did not indicate my disapproval of or opposition to the building or fee." So far, nine of fourteen of the signed statements have been returned to the intramural office by the student leaders with only five to come back. Of these nine, only one said he would oppose the building and that person was Ebert.
4. The announcement of the building was held back pending the announcement of the grant given for the Krannert Performing Arts Center. The D.I. was pledged to secrecy on announcing anything about the intramural building only until the President could make it official. Only a relatively small amount of money had been spent in gaining information about similar buildings on other campuses and on trips to see what several architectural firms had done in gymnasium building. The amount of money spent on these inspection tours had nothing to do with going ahead on the announcement of the building.

5. 11/17 At no time were the students as a group asked to talk over the wisdom of such an elaborate building. It seems that student opinion was not wanted so much as student token approval.
6. 11/17 ...indeed repeated efforts were made to keep the student body ignorant of the project.
7. 11/16 The students who were taken into confidence were not encouraged to give their own thoughtful advice on the project, nor was their advice headed.
8. 11/19 Student opinion was not consulted on the proposed Intramural Building.
9. 11/19 Student leaders were manipulated to give a gloss of student consent to a project which was slickly pushed through in secret.
10. 11/19 The Intramural Building will cost each student between \$15 and \$24 a year.
11. 11/19 This is an issue which, if successfully resolved, could bring you a better education and a better life.
12. 11/20 The student leaders, so-called and otherwise, were not informed about the building last semester.
5. The Flow Chart shows as do previous D.I. stories that the President requested students to express their opinions and give their suggestions about the proposed building.
6. Check the Flow Chart
7. After the inspection tour of the facilities at Michigan State, Indiana, and Purdue, the "Token Leaders" met with the Associate Provost, Dr. Kenny, and Dean McCristal to discuss the type of building they would like to see built. The suggested list of operation policies for the building after some revision was accepted as being feasible.
8. See 1-4-5-7 above. Greenburg's thesis questionnaire
9. Students were never manipulated unless you can call the dispensing of information about the building a manipulation. The building was approved by the Board of Trustees in perhaps the most widely publicized meeting that the Board ever had.
10. This is a half truth in that it is implied in the statement that the present students on campus would have to pay the fee. He didn't state that only the students in school when the building is completed would pay a fee for it.
11. The fact is that the lives or education of the students would only be effected, and for the better, if the building was constructed. The non-existence of adequate recreational facilities invariably leads to anti-social actions on the part of many students.
12. But the student leaders were informed of the building December 8-10 when 14 of them were called in to talk with the Director of the Division of Intramurals and with the Supervisor of the men's program. How often must the students be advised of progress? Every day? Every week?

Every month? Where was Roger in his capacity as Editor of the D.I. when it came to keeping the student body informed?

13. 11/20 Student leaders should refuse to participate in projects which they do not think can be kept secret legitimately from their fellows.
13. The student leaders who made the inspection tour were never pledged to secrecy or told that they couldn't talk about the building. In fact Larry Beaupre was encouraged to write a story about the trip and how the University had enlisted the support and advice of the students in planning the building. These persons making the tour were given materials about the proposed building, i.e. The Status Report and the Revised Prospectus.
14. 12/2 But can a group of students go somewhere and simply check out a football for an afternoon, like a chess set at the Union? What? Without an official, scorecard, an eligibility list, a paid referee and team points? It's unhygienic and subversive.
14. Roger's lack of research, a research which would only consist of reading the Handbooks for men and women, kept him from knowing that the Division of Intramural Activities issues equipment for free play and will when feasible reserve a court or field for unorganized play. The Student Letter of November 20 gave a resume of the intramural program and told how free time play is encouraged.
15. 12/2 Abolish systems of team points and trophies in the IM program. Discourage "house teams" which seem to be motivated by trophies and other irrelevant rewards.
15. If Roger had asked, he would have discovered that in the past year eight men's sports were removed from the point category. The women don't have a point system and neither is there one for co-rec sports. Why should we abolish trophies? Why not abolish academic grades, journalism awards, newspaper recognition, All-American teams, etc. How is it possible to determine which teams might be motivated by trophies? Should we abolish the total program?
16. 12/2 Encourage unorganized, spontaneous sports on campus by making facilities and space available on this basis. Allow students to play a game of football without committing themselves to eight weeks of practice and strategy.
16. Again, a look at the Recreation Schedule would show Ebert that hundreds of hours a week can be totalled for the facilities that are open and supervised for unorganized spontaneous play. A lack of organization would result in chaos. Can you imagine several hundred basketball teams policing themselves as they all attempt to play in limited facilities at the same time?

Any group of students can play football or basketball without getting into organized competition. The Intramural Division even furnishes equipment, lockers, towels, and reserves courts for this unorganized play. What more can we do?

17. 12/2 Encourage bona fide sports inspired by love of the activity, such as the soccer, rugby and ice hockey teams.

17. Roger was editor of the D.I. when all of the furor was raised about making that group of amateur soccer players into an organized varsity sport. The same has been true of ice hockey and rugby. Those fun-loving boys don't want to remain "amateurs." Again, Ebert should read our handbooks and flyers that tell about the 22 sports clubs that exist on this campus. Most of them were encouraged, promoted, and assisted by the Intramural Division. It seems that these facts have appeared many times in his "newspapers" when he was editor.