

ASUO Elections Endorsements

As Close Observers of Campus Politics,
We Will Once Again Make Our Choices

Once again the Emerald Editorial Board will interview candidates for ASUO Senate positions and endorse the candidates it thinks best suited.

We do this because we think the Emerald is the only student organization on the campus which is able to consider all candidates objectively and make recommendations based on first hand observation of student government. We do not intend to tell students how they should vote, but we do feel an obligation to tell the students what candidates we think are best. The students are free to accept our judgment or not as they see fit.

Interviews of candidates who survive the primary elections will be held Saturday.

The recommendations will be published the following Monday and Tuesday, April 15 and 16, and the general election will be held Wednesday, April 17.

This year we will not endorse candidates for ASUO President, for two of the three

candidates have been connected with the Emerald and an endorsement for either might be misunderstood. We will, likewise, not endorse a candidate for any office where one of the candidates has been connected with the Emerald, or where we think the candidates are equally qualified.

On April 15, the Emerald will publish a four-page pull-out section containing statements by all candidates for office. We will also ask candidates for ASUO President to answer a series of questions and will print their answers to these questions, in order to help the students evaluate the positions and competence of the candidates.

We think that the procedure outlined is the best way to insure that voting students are properly informed about candidates so they can make an intelligent choice for the various offices. In this way, the University can maintain an informed and responsible student government.

The Discipline Code...

Editor's Note: At the request of the Discipline Committee we are reprinting the Discipline Code of the University of Oregon. For several months the Committee has been re-evaluating both the contents of the code and the philosophy behind it. Since both the minority and majority reports of the committee will be publicized in the near future, and the code itself will be the topic of considerable discussion among students and faculty, it seems appropriate that the students be given a chance to refresh their memory as to what the code contains.

The Discipline Committee is responsible, by faculty legislation and by delegation from the President of the University, for the formulation of policies relating to student behavior, for delegating the enforcement of these policies, and for imposing penalties under them.

The Discipline Committee consists of six University faculty members, three upper-division students, the Dean of Women and the Dean of Men. The University of Oregon is one of the few major state universities in the country where students have a voice in the administration of discipline. The Deans serve as advisers but do not vote on Committee motions.

The Discipline Code is presented so that the entire University and the student body may know the general policies and procedures followed by the Discipline Committee and the Office of Student Affairs.

Article I—Expulsions

The following offenses may result in expulsion or such other penalties as may be imposed. Expulsion means unconditional dismissal from the University.

1. Wanton destruction of property.
2. Drunkenness.
3. Gambling.
4. Falsifying information concerning overnight off-campus privileges.
5. Immorality.
6. Gross indecency.
7. Fraudulent registration.
8. Any action punishable under the State of Oregon Criminal Code.

Article II—Suspensions

The following offenses may result in suspension or such other penalties as may be imposed. Suspension means involuntary removal for a fixed period of time or until specific conditions are met.

1. Cheating.

2. Unauthorized absence from a living organization after closing hours.

3. Living in unauthorized housing or misrepresenting a place of residence.

4. Visiting (or permitting visits) by unchaperoned University or non-University women in men's living quarters.

5. Participation in an unchaperoned party in a hotel, motel, or other public lodging.

6. Providing or possessing liquor at any University-sponsored activity or in any University-controlled building or grounds.

7. Any other action that discredits the University of Oregon.

Article III—Organizations

1. Each University-sanctioned student organization on the campus is expected to conduct its affairs in a manner that reflects credit upon the good name of the group and the University.

2. Any student organization that violates a provision of Article I or Article II, or whose members do so in a manner that places responsibility on the group, is subject to such action as the Office of Student Affairs or the Discipline Committee may impose.

Article IV—Administration

1. Administration of this Code shall be the primary responsibility of the Dean of Women and the Dean of Men who may make final disposition of all cases except expulsion from the University.

2. The Dean of Women and the Dean of Men shall refer to the Discipline Committee all cases in which they recommend expulsion from the University.

3. The Dean of Women and the Dean of Men at their discretion may refer any case to the Discipline Committee who will consider the referral itself as evidence of the gravity of the alleged offense.

Article V—Inter-Campus Activities

Officials of the University of Oregon and Oregon State University have mutually agreed to take severe disciplinary action against any student who engages in vandalism, kidnapping, and/or other malicious acts. These acts may result in suspension from the institution.

Article VI—Automobiles

All students must register their cars. The privilege of any student to have a car on the campus may be revoked at any time for due cause. Students must not park in restricted areas. In driving they must observe the basic rule and other traffic regulations.



Letter to the Editor

More Than Sentiment, Age Involved in 'Saving the Side'

This letter is not specifically designed to support the crusade to preserve the College Side Inn: for I feel its destiny has long been determined. But, it is meant to be a direct reply to Brian M. du Toit's letter.

Mr. du Toit's letter seems to burp up the thought that crying over the College Side Inn is a ridiculous state of affairs, which stands in the way of progress, which rest on a sentimental foundation, and must be changed for the "new." In belaboring these ideas, Mr. du Toit used many strange and varied analogies. It is my expressed wish to examine these analogies and related thoughts.

IN WRITING this letter, I will sincerely try to refrain from using such ambiguous words as repose, respect, dignity, purpose, and other psychogenic words, which are many times part of the architectural jargon; which are very difficult to define and many times are used in a very vacant, empty manner.

First of all, Mr. du Toit wants to find out why all the architects are "shouting to save a lousy old building." It's curious to me that he can so easily call the Side a lousy old building, when most professional architects consider it a rather good building. Yet maybe Mr. du Toit is an architectural historian, in that case, his opinion would seem to be a worthy one. But, maybe Mr. du Toit is not an architectural critic. Well then, what is he? What does he represent? We shall find out.

A major part of Mr. du Toit's letter was concerned with being sentimental. He stated he could not understand "why people in the first place get sentimental over a building." Here, I believe, he is truly naive; he has burped-up something that not even he should be able to swallow. For if we look beyond the fact that architecture is utilitarian, primarily the housing and protection of human activity, we find that architecture is a reflection of society, of people, of man: Greece, through its classical orders in architecture, mirrors the simple, the direct, the idealized glory of its ancient world, producing an everlasting image of a highly sophisticated Greek society; the Romans also used the classical orders, but their massive, weighty architectural forms were not that of a Greek image, no, they were reflections of the pomp, the pageantry, and the power of imperial Rome. The history of man has everywhere shown that architecture has played an integral part in man's expression of his

society, his goals, and his aspirations; be it good or bad, we have to decide this—the good we take to heart, and the bad we cast aside. In architecture's evolution, the good seems to be known: when we think of Greece, it is the Parthenon; in England, it is Westminster Abbey; in Rome, it is the Colosseum; in Venice, it is St. Marks; in Paris, it is Notre Dame. These are monuments the world has taken to heart: these are the emotional, the romantic, the sentimental hallmarks of architecture—these truly evoke sentimental attachment for thousands.

I NOW HOPE the sentimental is better understood. For we all, at some time or another, have to sympathize with man's past to better understand man's present and future. Architecture is an expression in the drama of man's struggle; to sympathize, to understand, and become sentimental is also part of this drama—it is part of being human.

Before I go any further, I must say that I have no intentions of comparing the College Side Inn to the Parthenon, or any other architectural monument. The Side is a good piece of architecture, but it is not a Parthenon. It never was and it never will be; praise and eulogy will not lift it to the level of a Parthenon. A building is never

(Continued on page 3)

OREGON DAILY EMERALD

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published seven times in September and five days a week during the school year, except during examination and vacation periods by the Student Publications Board of the University of Oregon. Entered as second class matter at the post office, Eugene, Oregon. Subscription rates: \$5 per year; \$2 per term.

Opinions expressed on the editorial page are those of The Emerald and do not pretend to represent the opinions of the ASUO or the University.

RON BUEL, Editor
MARTY KETELS, Business Manager
TED MAHAR, Managing Editor
EVERETTE DENNIS, News Editor
PHIL COGSWELL, Editorial Page Editor
LARRY WILLIAMS, Advertising Manager
JOHN BUCHNER, Sports Editor
DULCY MORAN, Assistant Managing Editor
RON COWAN, **JIM FRAKE**, **JANET GOETZE**, Assistant News Editors
GEORGE BIGHAM, Photo Editor
LINDA BROWN, Entertainment Editor
CATHY NEVILLE, Associate News Editor
DICK RICHARDSON, Feature Editor

EDITORIAL BOARD:

Ron Buel, Phil Cogswell, Ted Mahar
 Everette Dennis,
 Dulcy Moran, Linda Brown
 Bob Forsyth, Hal Snow,
 Grant Ledgerwood, Doug Ragen
 Janet Goetze, and Bill Hutchison