

Student Union Board

Although its existence goes largely unnoticed, there is a Student Union Board that makes policy decisions for activities and events within the Student Union. This year the board has made some important decisions that will have a great effect on the extra curricular educational and recreational programs offered to future University students.

The Recreational Council that is being organized to handle outdoor sports clubs is a plan that has been established this year. The council will streamline the organizational structure of sports and games, a program which has outgrown the Student Union Directorate.

The board has also taken steps to establish an off-campus recreation camp financed through the Student Development Fund. Informal student discussion groups as well as weekend athletes will be able to use the facilities of the proposed camp.

A highly-praised academic retreat pro-

gram has been initiated and carried out by members of this year's board. Through the retreat plan, students and faculty have been brought together in an informal setting for discussion on various topics of interest.

Several art objects that will soon go on display in the Student Union have been purchased through direction of the SU Board. This is part of a program to provide visual art for enjoyment in places frequented by students.

Besides these more ambitious programs, the Board has also provided funds for magazines in Taylor Lounge. A magazine rack with a variety of reading will be permanently established in the lounge before long.

The plans that have been made by this year's board will give the new board that will take over at the end of the term greater administrative responsibilities in the next year while offering a more varied educational and recreational program to students.

Majority Report and Responsibility

Critics of the Majority report on the University discipline code have pointed out that the philosophy which the majority report supports is a dangerous one. These critics feel that such a philosophy could lead to unbridled recklessness; that the freedom of many individuals could be hurt. They remind us of the need for controls and guidance in an interdependent community.

We would like to point out that the Majority report is not a leeway to complete freedom; it is not a sanction for any and all types of individual behavior. The report points out that "the student should be directly answerable to the community for violations of its required code of conduct. The University, in turn, should only exercise its disciplinary powers when the student's conduct directly and significantly interferes with the accomplishment of the University's goals. The report also reminds us that the student is both a member of a University and the broader community "and responsible to each in the appropriate areas of their authority and responsibility."

Unrestrained freedom is impossible in current society, for the freedom of one group or individual beyond certain limits infringes upon the freedom of others. The people writing the majority report realize this. They have not called for uncontrolled freedom. They have, however, made a distinction between the areas of responsibility which should and should not concern the University. And more importantly, they have placed the responsibility of freedom on the individual student.

For the philosophy of the majority report to be acceptable and workable, the student is going to have to assume more responsibility. No longer will he have the "protection" of the University standing between him and the community. He alone will be responsible for his actions. And because he has more freedom, he will have to make sure that his actions do not hurt the rights of others.

Some question whether University students are willing to "become adults." We are reminded of what is taught in some sociology classes on campus: Two functions of the University are 1) to extend the period of infancy and 2) to isolate youth from the adult world. We believe that these functions only create greater problems in the world and do not aid the student in becoming a responsible adult. A college should help students with their transition into the adult world, not separate this transition from that world. The majority report has recognized this fact: "The approach to the regulation of student conduct should be based on the premise that the development of responsible behavior is not effectively realized by policies which unduly prolong independence and immaturity."

Those writing the majority report are well aware of the problems involved if their philosophy is accepted. They have staked much on the hope that students will respond in a mature, responsible manner.

Are students able and willing to accept such responsibility? We think so. We hope they are given the chance to do so.



"WHY DON'T YOU TRY A 50-MILE HIKE AND A COLD SHOWER?"

Letters to the Editor

Ridiculousness

Emerald Editor:

It amazed me to read the graduate student's letter this morning. Of all the nonsensical ideas I've ever read, this is the worst. The U.S. National Bank is a good dependable bank. It sells checks in the same manner and for the same price as other banks do. Banks must charge something otherwise they will lose money. And, if you want to bank at the Citizen's Bank, go ahead. I won't bank there because of a personal reason. Actually I think this graduate student wrote a worthless and trivial letter.

Frank Oulman,
Freshman, Languages.

NSA Resolutions

Emerald Editor:

Student body of U. of Oregon just voted to join National Students Association. NSA passed these five resolutions at its last annual convention:

- 1) Defense of Japanese students rioting against former President Eisenhower.
- 2) Praise for Fidel Castro's educational "reforms."
- 3) Recommendation that the House Un-American Activities Committee be abolished.
- 4) Criticism of U.S. aid to such allies as Spain and Portugal, but not a word of complaint concerning U.S. aid to Yugoslavia and Poland.
- 5) Denunciation of U.S. measures to achieve nuclear superiority.

Resolution 5 encourages shoddy work and shoddy work sunk the Thresher, so U. of Oregon

students are helping to dig their own watery graves.

U. of Oregon students specifically adopted resolution 3.

Texas, Indiana and other universities are ousting NSA.

Lawrence Meissner,
Deer Island, Ore.

Opening Blast

Emerald Editor:

This newspaper last Monday reported the current fulminations of a twice-defeated local politician, who wants to "aid" a three-day student "research" conference on campus to see China policy as he sees it. I think this man shows astonishing lack of judgment in assuming he can do more in three days with China policy than is done in classes by half a dozen resident faculty who have devoted much of the past fifteen years to analyzing precisely this problem.

Should students want to subject themselves to three days of "managed" bombast, fluster and bluster, it is their privilege in a free community. Only a few would be fooled, however, into seeing such sessions as more than the opening blast in a reelection campaign.

Forrest R. Pitts,
Chairman East Asian
Studies Program.

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.

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, Everett Dennis,
Dulcy Moran, Linda Brown, Bob Forsyth, Hal Snow, Grant Ledgerwood, Doug Ragen, Janet Goetze, and Bill Hutchison

Phil Cogswell

A Dissection of NSA Legal Arguments

Tonight, the ASUO Senate will hear claims by some students from the Law School, with Walt Grebe as their spokesman, that if the University joins the National Students Association it will be a violation of the rights of those who might disagree with some of the opinions expressed by NSA.

The law students' argument hinges on the fact that University students are obligated to pay money into the student activity fund. Part of this money would go to pay the membership fees for NSA. They claim that NSA takes stands of a political nature with which they might disagree, although these stands are taken in the name of students in general. Thus, since they are compelled to pay money which goes to support an organization engaging in political activity, the law students claim that their rights under

the First and Fourteenth amendments are being violated.

THESE CLAIMS, and the ramifications involved, form a very complicated matter, but they raise an interesting point for consideration as well. Although NSA and student fees are a fairly trivial issue in the field of civil rights, they reflect the increasing necessity for determining what compulsory organizations can and cannot do.

There are two 1961 Supreme Court cases from which inferences can be drawn which might relate to the Law Students' claims, but neither of these cases is actually a precedent as such.

One case, IAM v. Street, involved a union which maintained an active political interest, including supporting candidates for office, contributing to campaigns, and taking stands on political issues. Membership in the union was compulsory for

certain workers under a union shop agreement.

In this case, the Supreme Court did not rule directly on the constitutionality of the issue but instead interpreted the federal labor legislation in such a way that the individual's constitutional rights were protected. The Court assumed that Congress, in making the law, intended to protect civil liberties. Under this interpretation the use of compulsory dues for political purposes by this union was declared illegal, although not directly unconstitutional.

The other relevant case, Lathrop v. Donohue, concerned the Wisconsin Bar Association, also a compulsory organization. Here, the association was apparently taking stands on state issues of interest to lawyers, although some members disagreed with the stands.

In this case, the court never

reached a majority ruling on the Constitutional issue.

There were, however, several minority opinions which mentioned, among other things, that the Association might have a right to take stands on matters relating directly to its members but that more general political activity might take the group too far into politics.

IT CAN be seen that neither of these cases clarifies the issue very much as regards NSA. Certainly, they are not firm precedents.

Since the Supreme Court has never ruled on a case quite like NSA, the claims of Mr. Grebe and his fellow law students are open to a great deal of dispute. It might be worthwhile to examine some of the various points which a court would have to resolve if a case like this ever did get to court.

(Continued on page 3)