

Explains Building Stand**Haugen Denies Faculty Has
'Given Up' Fight For Woods**

Prof. Einar Haugen, who has been a faculty leader in opposition to destruction of trees in Bascom Woods for construction of an Economics-Sociology Building, declared in an open letter to the University Regents today that the woods form a natural resource of Wisconsin, which, if destroyed, can never be recaptured.

Prof. Haugen told the Regents that many will be watching their meeting Saturday at which the Board will act on construction of the building.

The chairman of the University Scandinavian Department denied that the faculty has "given up" its opposition to building in the woods. He said the faculty clearly stated that it favors limitation of construction to only one building.

The statement follows:

"If I take the liberty of addressing you directly, it is for the purpose of advising you not to fall into the error proclaimed in the newspapers today: that the faculty has 'given up' its opposi-

(Continued on Page 4, Col. 3)

**Surrender
On Woods
Is Denied**

(Continued from Page 1)

tion to building in Bascom Woods. The story as released to the press gave this impression by stating that the resolution would permit the erection of the proposed Social Studies building.

"The facts are otherwise. The clear intent of the resolution was to urge upon you the limitation of building to one building, if you should decide to build any building there at all. As I declared on the floor of the faculty, I am just as opposed to all inroads on Bascom Woods today as I was at the earlier meeting. But I felt that it was important to establish a minimum on which the entire faculty could agree. As long as the previous meeting showed that a majority of the faculty could not be persuaded to vote against the building, for a variety of reasons, at least we should use the opportunity now to show that the faculty opposed destruction of the lake path and the lower woods. On this it was possible to get agreement, and it was this spirit of 'saving the pieces' that more than a hundred faculty members signed the attached petitions during the weeks just before this meeting. They were not 'giving up,' but asking that if the destruction were ordered, it should not also include the lower area which was buildings on the sketch-plan submitted to us.

"One thing is certain: the faculty would have voted thunderously against any building in the woods, if the building of a social studies unit had not been made contingent on this wanton destruction. There is widespread dissatisfaction at a policy which forced three departments to vote against the interests of the University community and their own convictions in order to get a building for themselves. A mere fourteen votes changed at the meeting of Jan. 12 would have meant a clear defeat for the policy espoused by the Planning Commission and the Administration.

"Correspondence and calls received over the past weeks have convinced me that many are watching you with anxiety and concern at your coming meeting. At your public hearing, not one person appeared in favor of the Commission's plan. These woods form a natural resource of Wisconsin, which is easily destroyed and can never be recaptured. For an alternative site, you need only look at the slope east of the Extension Building or on Observatory Hill."