

Weak Majority Endorsement

Senate Action Not a Meaningful Indication Of Student or Senators' Viewpoints

Although some senators seemed to obscure the central issue, the ASUO Senate managed a weak endorsement of the Student Discipline Committee's majority report last Thursday. The close 11-10 vote was not a meaningful indication of either the senators' or students' sentiments on the student discipline controversy.

Four senators announced after the vote that they agreed with the majority report's philosophical basis, but would not support the document's specific recommendations. Campus viewpoint as expressed by the ASUO President, AWS President, the ASUO Cabinet, and other groups indicates that the students would not be likely to stand behind the Senate's 11-10 vote.

The four senators who clarified their stands did not want to give unequivocal support to the majority report, yet they seemed to be slightly confused about the motion they voted on. It is apparent that the senators voted from two different frames of reference. Some seemed to be backing the majority report on its general philosophy while at least four others voted in regard to specific recommendations. Perhaps Senator Bruce Brothers' motion to endorse the majority report should have been clarified as to philosophy or specifics prior to the vote.

It seems rather strange that the four senators who agreed in philosophy didn't clarify themselves before they took their stand. From its inception the majority report has been presented as philosophical guidelines for a revised discipline system. The essence of the report is expressed in the statement which contends that it is "the responsibility of the University to educate each student so that his capacity for rational and creative thinking and the ability to choose wisely between alternatives are developed to the highest possible degree. Moral growth and character development are thus viewed as possible outcomes rather than the primary purpose of the University."

Some senators who voted against the majority report express concern over the

recommendation which states that "the University should distinguish its proper disciplinary responsibilities from the control functions of the larger community." This would mean that the student would be directly answerable to the community for violations of its required code of conduct. The University in turn would only exercise its disciplinary powers when the student's conduct directly and significantly interfered with the accomplishment of the University's goals.

The argument given here is that a student who commits a civil offense is often given "a better deal" if he is turned over to University authorities for discipline. Under the majority report recommendation the civil authorities would prosecute many cases now handled by the University.

Those who support special treatment for University students would hardly find their views compatible with the concept of equality and justice. By the same token they are not willing to accept the responsibility which the majority report demands. The majority report is not necessarily a "liberalization" of rules, but guidelines to redefine the philosophical basis for student discipline. With acceptance of the majority report students would get some liberalization of the present discipline code, but would also take on an added responsibility in facing equitable justice.

Special treatment calls for value judgments from civic authorities who report that a student offender is "really a good boy and should be given another chance." A second value judgment is required from the Office of Student Affairs. For some this special treatment system has been beneficial. Some students who might have been suspended from the University have been admitted to law and graduate schools on the dean's recommendations. But just as the special treatment has worked to the advantage of some, so has it been detrimental to others. It isn't often that we hear the latter stories, but those who advocate the special treatment philosophy should think twice before taking a strong stand on the majority report.



"I KEEP HEARING BELLS. FIRST THEY PEAL, AND THEN THEY TOLL."

Letters to the Editor

Favor Majority Report

Emerald Editor:

We would like to clarify our position on the recent Senate stand in favor of the majority report of the student discipline committee.

The resolution passed 11-10. Because of previous commitments we were not present for the vote. We understood that we could cast absentee ballots; however, our assumption proved to be false.

We both FAVOR the majority report. If our votes had been counted, the motion would have been passed by a stronger 13-10 vote.

Linda Peterson,
ASUO Senator-at-large
Warren Heinke
U.C. Men's Dorm Rep.

Brother Antoninus

Emerald Editor:

Those of us who experienced Brother Antoninus and his poetry, however we may feel about the success of his reading, realize the monumental task he faced in communicating his impressions. The true artist, in whatever media he expresses himself, must give freely of himself to give meaning to his work. In so doing, he places himself in a highly vulnerable position, with his most personal beliefs exposed to the public.

One may accept or reject his work, then, by reason of its message or its expression. Yet respect must be given a true artist, as one would respect a friend who gives a gift, whether the gift be appropriate or not.

SURELY, THEN, the attitude of the introductory speaker at last Wednesday's Browning Room Lecture was insulting at best. He began the program by carefully pointing out Antoninus' faltering past, and then explaining how the Dominican's power arose from the conflict between his Catholic orthodoxy and his free spirit as a poet.

He ended with noting which campus organizations had "borne the burden" of sponsoring the poet. After the recital, he expansively concluded that the reading had been "interesting," and that questions would be inappropriate, "especially in this case."

We the undersigned not only reject the introductory speaker's work, but his very position in the art of speaking.

Frank Cox
Senior, Gen. Science
Steve Vartan
Sophomore,
Architecture
Phil Russell
Sophomore, Pre-Med.

Vandalism

Emerald Editor:

I am the owner of a small but conspicuous, British-made sports

car. I park it in a University-owned and patrolled lot on the corner of 15th and Alder.

Yesterday (Thursday), sometime between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., some person(s) (who was evidently familiar with the rather tricky combination involved in entering these vehicles) literally "lifted" the horn button from the car's steering wheel while it was parked in a corner space of said lot, within full view of two fraternities. (I'd like to remark here that over a year's interval, when the vehicle was parked in lots and on streets in an up-town Portland apartment area, it was never the object of any sort of vandalism.)

GRANTED, THIS is not a big deal, but it is plenty irritating to me, not only in the inconvenience of being temporarily without a horn—a necessity at times for the small car owner who must drive more defensively (especially in Eugene) than the driver of a Detroit monster—but in the not-so-insignificant expense involved in replacing the item. Parts for these cars, even small ones, are not cheap. The fact that this particular object is not routinely kept in stock by the local dealer will only add to the stature of its value, I'm sure, in the eyes of the petty pilferer.

Who could have done the deed? Surely not a University of Oregon student, since I gather from the persual of multitudinous articles and letters re obsolete dorm regulations and Codes of Conduct in the Emerald during past weeks that today's student is by far too ma-

(Continued on page 3)

Professor Lorwin On France

A Distinguished Scholar Looks at the Atlantic Union

It is unusual when we comment on the Browning Room lecture in an editorial, but we think that this Wednesday's lecture deserves special mention.

Van R. Lorwin, professor of history, will speak on "France and the Atlantic Community." Lorwin is considered one of the leading authorities in the United States on the comparative history of European economic, political, and social movements of the 20th century, especially on the history of France. He is interested in the French labor movement and has written a book, "The French Labor Movement." Lorwin has spent most of his life doing research and studies on France. He has lived for several years in France, and was a student in France before World War II.

At his lecture Wednesday night, Lorwin will discuss the resurgence of France after World War II; the vitality of their economic recovery; the difficulty of the French

in finding a suitable political life; De Gaulle's rejection of Britain's entry into the European Common Market; the launching of the European coal and steel community, which preceded the Common Market; and the long crises of French relations with Indochina and Algeria.

Last month Lorwin attended the Society for French Historical Studies at Harvard and was chairman of the committee on Current French Problems in Historical Perspective. He has served with the State Department, including attendance as a member of the Staff of U.S. Delegations at various United Nations meetings in Geneva and New York.

Lorwin is a brilliant conversationalist, and a man with a pungent wit, and should provide a very interesting as well as informative talk. We urge all to attend the lecture.

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.

EVERETTE DENNIS, Editor
LARRY WILLIAMS
Business Manager
JANET GOETZE, Managing Editor
RON COWAN, News Editor
DOUG RAGEN,
Editorial Page Editor
JIM SPEER,
Advertising Manager
DICK RICHARDSON,
Associate Editor
JIM FRAKE,
Assistant Managing Editor
RAY MAST, Sports Editor
CANDY HEMMING,
CATHY NEVILLE,
Assistant News Editors
GEORGE BIGHAM, Photo Editor
CHUCK BEGGS, JOE BERGER,
PHYLLIS ELVING,
Associate News Editors
ALENE SHARFF
Entertainment Editor
JO GRISWOLD, Women's Editor