

Watson's Discipline Report

Donald Watson, associate professor of finance, who has been chairman of the student-faculty discipline committee for some time, makes some good points in his report on the student discipline code. Much of his report, however, seems muddled and self-contradictory.

It is typical of Watson's report that in one particular area, administration, he is both strongest and weakest. His feeling that the appeal of discipline decisions to a student-faculty committee should not be automatic in all instances is well taken. His statement that, "If the aim of the majority recommendations is to induce student responsibility, then he must be assumed to be capable of appealing his case," makes good sense. However, he neglects the fact that the majority did not recommend that all cases be automatically appealed, only those which result in the individual leaving school.

Although he sees the individual student as responsible enough to appeal his own case, at a later point in his report he says, "The Office of Student Affairs could in effect act as a filter to advise students on whether it would be advisable or reasonable to appeal and could also suggest someone to help the student with his appeal."

He tries hard to make the point that, "to reverse or over-ride decisions leads only to friction, indecision, and eventually complete failure of administration. Review is desirable, but reversal of decisions is impractical in this instance." Then at a later point, talking about the single disciplinary officer he would like to see appointed, he says, "but he should know that he can be reversed."

Perhaps the weakest part of his statements relative to administration of a discipline code is his statement, "To make all cases automatically appealable would bring to a committee composed of non-specialist students and faculty some cases not suited to its disposition." We wonder exactly whose disposition they would be suitable to. Does not a jury of peers make the decisions in modern-day courts? Students and faculty who are well-grounded in the Uni-

versity discipline code would be just as effective in administering that discipline code as any administrator, even if they were relatively inexperienced. They would certainly be more consistent than the administrators who are currently judge, jury, and court of appeals in the Office of Student Affairs. As for whether or not students and faculty would be more just, this depends upon the definition of justice one accepts.

We think that Watson's report is just as hazy when he talks about whether or not a University should be involved in character development. His main point of argumentation is that the majority report is based on the premise that education and moral growth are mutually exclusive, while he feels that the two are not mutually exclusive. To back up his feeling he makes three different statements: 1) that education "has always involved moral standards" 2) that, "One of the basic purposes of education is to orient the individual to society with an understanding of its rules and practices" and 3) that moral growth, "is not only consistent with, but is a desirable accompaniment of education."

The majority report does not have as a basic premise that education and moral growth are mutually exclusive. It recognizes that although education may "involve moral standards," this is quite different from imposing these standards upon individuals in their life outside the classroom. It also recognizes that education "may orient the individual to society with an understanding of its rules and practices," but that is quite different from forcing him to accept these rules as being correct.

As for the statement that moral growth is a "consistent and desirable accompaniment of education," here Watson admits what he is arguing against—that the two are different and mutually exclusive. If they are, his whole argument is wasted.

There are several other places where Watson's report is similarly confused.

Basically then, in attempting to adhere to a somewhat middle-of-the-road position, Watson ended up with a confused and confusing report that is acceptable in some areas and self-defeating in others.



Tom Mongar

Recent NSA Opposition Illustrates Practical Politics

The following column was submitted to the Emerald by Tom Mongar, former ASUO Senator and a graduate student in political science. Columns printed on this page do not necessarily represent the views of the Emerald or the Emerald editorial board.

The recent opposition to NSA by a group of law students headed by Walter Grebe provides some interesting data which demonstrates the utility of several time-honored principles of practical politics.

First, always shift the issue to a decision-making arena which you control. If you can control the arena of conflict, you can also control the outcome of the game. Neil Goldschmidt first introduced NSA in the Senate after defeating Bill Vertrees for the ASUO presidency. Mr. Vertrees retaliated by organizing and leading the assault which defeated NSA. It was then shifted to a more democratic, public arena when Raul Soto-Seelig circulated petitions to place it on the ballot. The student body passed the measure by majority vote, but, as everyone should know, politics never ends when the voting stops. Because the proponents of NSA very foolishly neglected to include an "enabling" clause in the proposition, it is now up to the Senate to recommend a budget and decide how many delegates there will be, how they will be chosen, etc. The opponents of NSA must now transfer their activity to the more private, autocratic arena of the Senate, where they will try to disable and destroy NSA.

Second, if you lose a fight, never renew the conflict yourself—get an uninvolved, "elder statesman" to do it for you. Mr. Vertrees is not renewing his dispute. No, Mr. Grebe, who is also a budding attorney, is presenting the case for twenty or so righteously indignant budding attorneys, who, apparently, don't get excited enough to act until after elections. Mr. Grebe is an ex-ASUO President.

Third, shift the issue to an area where you have particular expertise. If those making the decision are dependent upon your particular knowledge, you have effectively supplied one of the premises for the decision. Until now, NSA has been a political issue; now, Mr. Grebe is attempting to make it a legal one. And who is most fitted to give advice on legal question? Lawyers, who else?

Fourth, when opposing, al-

ways attempt to look humble, but at the same time hold out the possibility of protracted, expensive sanctions. According to Mr. Grebe "We are just asking for a chance to make our views known to the ASUO Senate, but if necessary we could resort to court action."

Fifth, if you lose, always try to minimize the winner's victory. Quoth Grebe: "In view of the close vote, I feel that we should overturn it. I am impressed with the closeness of the vote considering that the student body president candidates, Neil, and the Emerald support NSA." To say nothing of the \$70.00, full-page Emerald ad purchased by the opponents of NSA. Opponents of the HUAC vote, at the last Senate meeting, managed to have included in the letters to various people and agencies, the fact that "only" a small percent of the student body voted. All of which neglects the fact that a decision not to vote is still a vote, and simply says "I don't care either way."

Strategists, no matter how cleverly conceived, cannot destroy the existence of fact. What are the facts? Mr. Grebe's opposition centers around three complaints: 1) a majority should not be allowed to sanction the use of a minority's money in an organization (NSA) which has political

(Continued on page 3)

Letters to the Editor

Worthy Technique

Emerald Editor:

Your editorial entitled "Constitutional Confusion" utilizes an interesting technique of persuasion which is worthy of consideration. The editorial takes a negative approach by attempting to undermine the motives of the law students as well as the intelligence of the Senate members. It would have been refreshing to read a more objective analysis of a controversy rather than a shotgun attack on the opposition. The editorial might have been more effective if evidence had been cited supporting the editor's position rather than merely questioning the opposition. Our concern is not with the pros and cons of NSA but that evidence can be substituted for assumptions.

Judy Barnhart

Judy Drummond

Dianne Coy

Graduates in Speech

Chopsticks

Emerald Editor:

Charles Porter, the man who has run for everything else in the State of Oregon, is now running for the position of "Missionary Representative of the State of Oregon to Communist China." His platform again, as in the past, consists primarily of recognizing Red China.

He seems to feel that we should throw away a policy which has served us for 13 years. A policy by the way which has yet to be proven outmoded by Mr. Porter and cer-

tainly a policy felt beneficial by our State Department. Mr. Porter believes that instead we should follow the other nations who have recognized Red China. But has he ever shown any practical benefits that have come their way? No! The only possible advantage expounded by Porter is trade in non-strategic goods with the Chinese. The goods the Chinese need from us consist of capital goods which are definitely strategic. And what can they give us in exchange. Mr. Porter, when in Congress long ago, told us, "Tung oil, chestnuts, edible apricot kernels, tea, carpet, wool and hooked rugs, furs, soya beans, hog bristles, egg products and silk." A very impressive list to those among us who care for edible apricot kernels. The Chinese aren't going to trade with us if there isn't an enormous gain for them. A fact Mr. Porter won't face up to.

Mr. Porter wants to help open the windows to Red China. I would suggest he take along a welder to cut the Red chains of nationalism which keep them closed. I would further suggest, that once he sticks his head in that window, he beware of falling chopsticks.

Wiley Wright

Junior in Rhetoric

and Public Address

Monopoly of Liberalism

Emerald Editor:

We were very encouraged by the large conservative-minded vote on the recent HCUA-NSA referendum. Probably if more of

those who did not vote had done so, the "issues" would have been decided the other way. The fact that these non-voters were not "moved" by the heavily weighted propaganda barrage from the liberal element is evidence for this belief. The results of the voting seem to indicate that the "issues" were, as we have contended, stirred up by a small but highly vociferous group. We are hopeful that before long, leadership will arise within the silent but strong majority of this student body. Then, finally, this University will be one in which there is truly freedom of expression—with all sides given a fair and equal hearing. A step in the right direction was taken when the ASUO Senate voted to include the "yes" and "no" votes, along with the University enrollment, in the letters sent to government officials. This was the only fair procedure to follow and will show that it was, after all, a shallow "victory" in the HCUA "issue."

It is interesting to note that protests are already coming forth regarding NSA membership—less than a week after the election. It is unfortunate that they were not raised before, since this could very easily have resulted in a reversal of the outcome. The ASUO Senate would be well-advised to contact several of the schools that have disaffiliated from NSA recently, to learn of their reasons. Indiana University is the latest—

(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