

had been proved; and on Jan. 24 a motion had been introduced which would modify the new requirements so that they would indeed reflect the wishes which the study had reported.

The student members of the council made it plain that the new requirements do not represent their personal wishes. Even proponents of the new requirements confessed that the new requirements in all probability violate the wishes of the majority of the student body.

The council rejected every student proposal. Requirements which allegedly had been based on the wishes of the students were defended, in a muddle of contradictions, by denying the significance of those same wishes.

No amount of martial music and self-congratulatory speechifying can drown out the truth which the council's votes implied. When the chips are down at UT, students who have proved themselves more rational than faculty and administration can still be told that administration and faculty know best, that students are incapable of choosing for themselves and must accept, not what they say they need, but what bureaucracy says they ought to get.

That isn't excellence. That isn't even mediocrity. The students whose behavior redeemed an ugly performance were true celebrants of the Centennial, but their treatment proved that truth frees no one when power is indifferent to it.

*James Sledd  
Professor, English*

## **Centennial spirit**

As the celebration of the Centennial begins, the meeting of the University Council on Jan. 24 deserves commemoration, too.

The council was debating the new requirements in English. When those requirements were imposed, "the most compelling reason" for their adoption was said to be the wishes of faculty and students as those wishes had been expressed in a poll taken in 1975. That study had been grossly misrepresented, however; the misrepresentation