

A Weak Minority Report

The Minority Report on Student Discipline Is an Insult to an Educational Community

The minority report of the student discipline committee is exactly what one would expect of a defense of the current University policy concerning student conduct. It is very weak.

One part of the minority report says, "A code of student discipline which assumes that moral growth and character development are consistent parts of the general goals of this University is not only feasible but desirable."

The minority does not defend, clarify, enlarge upon, or explain this statement. What, for example, are the reasons of the minority for holding this view? To what extent should the University try to impose moral growth and character development? By what standards should the characters be developed? What other goals of the University involving moral growth and character development should be included in the category of goals? How should moral growth and character development be imposed upon the students: through enforced rules, through suggestions from some University office, through a required classroom course, through an elective classroom course, through dorm counselors?

THE MINORITY report's view is only a flat declaration. It is, moreover, characteristic of the policy Emerald Hall has apparently held for a long time: make a flat declaration, and if people want to know what it means they can come over to the office and we will explain it to them at our convenience. Most importantly, there is no explanation of who should decide what should be developed in character. It seems implicit in the report that someone in Emerald Hall should make the decision, but the qualifications which that person should have are not even suggested.

The second point of the minority report says, "Students of the University have a dual position in society which requires that they live under two sets of rules. . . . It is possible for a student to violate rules of both groups at once and therefore suffer some penalty from both or either."

WE CANNOT argue that students are not required to follow two sets of rules. Obviously, they do. But in some cases the rules overlap; that is, a person can be punished by the University for an offense that has no relation whatever to the fact that the offender is a student. In these cases two sets of rules exist because no one in the administration ever attempted to do away with the rules that overlap. The University now has the power to punish a student for a strictly civil offense. But this isn't right: University rules should govern students only where it is necessary to maintain the internal discipline of the University.

Specific laws prohibit specific crimes and provide specific punishments in society. In addition to the prescribed punishments of

the law, however, a student is subject to punishment from the University, namely expulsion, for "any action punishable under the State of Oregon Criminal Code."

The logic expressed in the third point of the minority report is an insult to the University community. "The enforcement of certain rules of conduct for women and not for men," the report states, "is consistent with practice and tradition in society generally. The different code is not intended to create different classes of citizens but is intended to recognize that society generally accords women a different role than men."

THE FIRST QUESTION suggested by this statement is this: Is the University of Oregon supposed to perpetuate the double standard simply because "society" does? In much of the country racial discrimination is accepted as a norm. Should the University also attempt to reflect this in the discipline code, perhaps with one code for the white race and another for non-white races?

And who the devil is society? Again, no explanation; just a nebulous name tag. See Emerald Hall for an interpretation.

The final recommendation of the minority is for a disciplinary officer separate from the Office of Student Affairs to make all judgments. Appeal would be limited only to cases where there had been "an error in the proceedings."

HOW CAN THE minority possibly recommend that one individual be judge, jury, and court of appeal? (Except, of course, in rare cases of error in the proceedings.) Again, no explanation or justification. Why shouldn't a student be judged by his peers? Again, no explanation.

Nor does the minority consider a very important point made by the majority report. What about instances of honest error in judgment or inappropriate use of authority. The minority provides no evidence in its report that the latter possibility was ever considered.

The minority report is not even an adequate defense of the present discipline code. It is a series of short, bland statements. It does not defend itself or make interpretations. It merely asks to be accepted the way it is. This is one of the problems the majority report is trying to solve.

Correction

In the printing of the minority report of the student discipline code Thursday, the Emerald left out a very important word.

One statement should have read, "A code of student discipline which assumes that moral growth and character development are consistent parts of the general goals of this University is not only feasible but desirable."

We left out the word, "only."



"YOU'VE BEEN ACTING LIKE A BUNCH OF CIVILIANS!"

Letters to the Editor

Majority Report

Emerald Editor:

I feel that the Majority Report of the joint faculty-student discipline committee is a step in the right direction. Now is it up to the students and faculty to see that its recommendations are followed.

Social change occurs in all societies, and it occurs even more rapidly in complex industrial societies like the United States. The University of Oregon is caught in this general cultural setting where out-moded standards which are institutionalized are no longer valid in terms of actual behavior. This report points the way to a necessary reform of the code and policy of this university to conform to the actual behavior and beliefs of our generation of students.

I hope that this Majority Report is not shuffled to some obscure committee headed by the Dean of Students or some other administrative officer, but that it will be the opening round of a grassroots debate on the boundaries of university authority in the discipline of students and the content of a new policy toward student discipline. Up to this time too much discretion has been left in the hands of the Dean of Men and Dean of Women who as hired bureaucrats should be administering policy set by an independent authority instead of making policy themselves.

I would like to see a new policy debated in open and free discussion. I would like to see discussions occur in dormitories and Greek houses, resolutions passed and letters to the editor written expressing beliefs about what the new policy should be, so that next year at this time we could see a proposal or a series of proposals submitted to the students in a general referendum for their approval or disapproval. This seems to me to be the most democratic way to approach this problem which has concerned so many.

W. B. Devall
Grad. Student

Some Ethics

Emerald Editor:

On the last page of the April 16, 1963, issue of the Daily Emerald was an advertisement urging that the students not vote for the NSA proposal. Listed at the bottom of that advertisement were several names, including Rick Dumm. Mr. Dumm is shown as being the Production Manager of KWAX. He is not now, nor has he ever been a member of the staff of radio station KWAX. I'm sure that Mr. Dumm had good intentions in having his name listed among the endorsers, but why wasn't his name sufficient?

There is considerable concern

on this campus regarding the ethical and moral values as concomitants of a liberal education. Advocates of student extra-curricular life continually point to the contribution of the student's activities toward character development. One wonders, however, how to bridge the gap between expressed ideals and actual behavior. In this particular case, Mr. Dumm assumed for himself a title and a position which he does not have in order to justify his endorsement of a campaign issue. This presumptuous act not only shows a lack of ethical and moral values we talk so much about, but casts aspersions upon the very worth of the issue he is supporting. In addition, by so doing he also involves an organization, KWAX, which by law is not permitted to take sides in a political issue. The public image of KWAX is in danger of extreme damage because of this behavior, and certainly places its license to operate in grave jeopardy.

Pursuit of excellence? Character development? Moral and ethical values? Social responsibility? Liberal education? I wonder . . .

William H. Thompson
Manager, KWAX

Editor's note: Mr. Dumm asserts that he did not assume the title; the authors of the advertisement assumed it for him.

About Letters

Letters to the editor must be signed and should include, if from a student, the writer's year and major. If not from a student they should contain the writer's position at the University or his address.

There is no maximum length for letters but those under 300 words will be given preferential treatment. Letters should be typewritten and double spaced.

The Emerald will also publish intelligently-written columns of campus or more general interest either by students or faculty members. Columns submitted should also be double spaced. Preferred length is between two and three typewritten pages.

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

Letters to the Editor

Against Umbrellas

Emerald Editor:

Mr. E. Palmer Hoyt's righteous indignation over the spread of umbrellas in Oregon perfectly voiced my own sentiment and I feel I should like to defend him and the Register-Guard editorial writer from your "sensible" comments on the subject. Let those of us who knew the campus before umbrellas, plastic rain hoods, plastic book covers, plastic rain coats and an

automobile for every student bespoke the slackening of spirit and independence among our college youth, let us cherish our poignant memories of the uncoddled young egg-heads of the past who strode indifferently through any kind of weather.

But while we are on the subject of rain and being sensible, in my day co-eds wore heavy, wooden-soled shoes for rain, clattering a little in the hallways, I admit, but rising well

out of the average puddle. Now look at what these modern umbrella-covered youngsters have on their feet—flimsy canvas affairs that are wet through half way to the first class. May the sensible Emerald editorial writer search his own heart, look at his own feet, and ask whether progress is really being made.

Mrs. Thelma Greenfield
Assistant Professor
Department of English