

Future of the Code

New Discipline System Cannot Operate Without Dedication of Administrators

The institution of any new system requires the dedication and commitment of those involved in its administration. The new student conduct code released last week by President Flemming is no exception. The code calls for a new system under which students themselves will take major responsibility for the administration of discipline. The new code recognizes that "the responsibility of the University is to educate each individual so that his capacity for rational and creative thinking and his ability to choose wisely between alternatives are developed to the highest possible degree."

The new code recognizes the need for college students to have independence and maturity. The old system will fade into the University's in loco parentis past. It appeared that the new code would become operative immediately. It appeared also that students of the University would embark on a new and exciting adventure. Just two days after President Flemming's announcement two University administrative deans addressed a meeting of the Salem Moms' and Dads' Club. The tenor of the speeches, according to a Salem journalist, indicated that the University had bitten off more than it could chew in adopting the new code.

The deans, Mrs. Golda P. Wickham, dean of women; and Francis B. Nickerson, newly appointed associate dean of students, have denied that the Salem newspaper story is accurate. Whether or not the deans were quoted out of context is not the major issue. The tone of the deans' discussion of the code was described as "apprehensive" by Mrs. Ralph B. Sipprell, president of the Salem Moms Club and two others present at the meeting.

Mrs. Wickham's position on the new concept of student discipline was made very clear last year when she signed the minority report on discipline, which sought to preserve the old system. We know that the new code was not established with Mrs. Wickham's blessing. Mr. Nickerson, how-

ever is another case. He was hired to help institute the new code. As independent disciplinary officer his is an important position in the new system. Without his dedication the new code will not reach its highest potential. There is always room for discussion and debate within the University community regarding any administrative policy, but we hardly think that it is proper for administrators, who are supposed to be instituting the new code, to express their doubts at a public meeting.

The question is not whether the new code will be established. This has already happened. The duty of the deans is to make the new code workable. We also believe that it is only fair to point out that according to Mrs. Sipprell's letter most of the parents came to the meeting "having no knowledge of the code other than what appeared in newspaper reports (and) were deeply concerned about the code and its implications." Mrs. Sipprell said, "the parents left the meeting as apprehensive about some of the code's provisions as the speakers, and felt that the code was adopted without adequate consultation by the faculty with parent groups."

We might point out that every element of the University community including the Oregon Moms and Dads were consulted by President Flemming in the drafting of the new code. The faculty was involved and so were the students. No one can fairly complain that he was not consulted.

We deplore the attempts made by the two officers of the Moms and Dads organization, who sought to influence the Salem Statesman to "tone down the story." We believe in the new concept of student discipline. We likewise are concerned that our administrators do more than give the new code a "fair trial." It is time for University administrators to stop stumping the state in opposition to the new code and come home and administer it. The future of the code rests in the hands of the students and administrators. We hope they meet the challenge.

Rush and Freshmen Orientation

This year formal rush was scheduled prior to orientation week so that rush and the personal crises which it presents to freshmen would not interfere with placement tests and orientation meetings. We do not believe that this year's procedure was satisfactory.

Members of Greek living organizations had to leave summer jobs two weeks early to put on a rush program for a much smaller number of rushees.

For fraternities, rush was an expensive enterprise in which hundreds of dollars are spent on pamphlets praising the achievements of members and the organization. Prospective members were entertained at parties and other gatherings during the summer. These expenses as well as the loss of summer income make rush for the fraternity member a large investment. The dividends from this investment were meager—there were fewer rushees and more drop outs this year than in the past. This was true of sororities as well.

Pre-orientation week placed the greatest burden on the rushees. They, too, had to quit summer jobs. They found it necessary to pay extra room and board. Placing rush before placement tests resulted in a vacuous, boring orientation program.

Orientation to the University through

rush is social, not academic and not consistent with the objectives of an academic orientation program. Rushees are presented with a back-slapping, join-and-conform image of campus life where emphasis is on personal appearance, who you know, and idle prattle. For those aspiring to pledge and for the members, decisions made on this basis can, have, and will continue to bring disappointments.

Inter-Fraternity Council and Panhellenic will review their rush programs this fall. In their own best interest, they should plan deferred rush in 1964-65. Fraternities particularly have been apprehensive about deferred rush, arguing that the long period before formal rush week will be filled by an expensive and time-consuming seduction of frosh "nuggets."

This is a weak argument. IFC is capable of setting up rules against "dirty-rush" tactics, and Panhellenic has proved itself to be a rule-making body, par excellence. Three years ago, the Faculty Advisory Council recommended deferred rush. Dean Robert Clark, Dean of Faculties and the President's office have expressed concern about current freshmen orientation. IFC and Panhellenic would do themselves and the University a service if they were to initiate action for deferred rush.

Herblock



"Observe Closely, Mi Amigo—"

Out With Quality

Pearson Would Lead University Back to 1926

By EVERETTE DENNIS
Emerald Editor

It was a sleepy, little country college, not much more than a Saturday afternoon football school. Twenty-nine new teachers joined the faculty that year. With a couple of exceptions they were a rather undistinguished lot, mostly old Oregon grads without advanced degrees, who had come back to teach.

This was the University of Oregon in 1926. It is difficult to imagine what the University

the standard which the state can afford. As the years went by Walter Pearson, class of '26 has become an influential member of the state government. Once state treasurer, president of the state senate and a candidate for governor, Senate Pearson's views have been important in the development of public policy.

What it was that soured Walter Pearson on higher education no one seems to know, but it is evident that he has never been a dedicated friend of the University. In the past two decades his roars have staunchly opposed increased education spending.

Flails at Education

Senator Edward Fadeley of Lane County, Pearson's junior by several years, believes that the Multnomah County legislator "is afraid his followers will find out that he is a college graduate and disown him so he madly flails away at the state's public higher education."

A few days ago, as everyone expected he would, Walter Pearson announced that he will oppose the legislative tax bill, which comes before the voters in an Oct. 15 election.

Ironically Pearson is vice chairman of the Senate Taxation Committee and not only helped draft the controversial tax bill, but also voted for it.

Champion of Students

But suddenly the same Senator Pearson, who voted against the bill to provide bonds for dormitories and married student housing last year seems to have become an ill-disguised champion of students.

The legislator has made it clear that in the event of a special session of the legislature, he will introduce legislation to strike down the State Board of Higher Education's projection, which would raise academic standards and tuition to maintain quality education.

Said Senator Pearson: "It is my intention to introduce a bill prohibiting increase of fees or raising of scholastic requirements for resident students."

"I do not think we need recognized leaders as teachers. I think we can get better teachers from the average teacher group, rather than those who spend their time writing books, which students are required to buy the next year."

He has summarized his position most effectively in the

(Continued on page 3)



SEN. WALTER PEARSON
Education's Arch Foe

was like in those early years long before the empire-building schemes of the 40's when the University's physical facilities developed.

The Excellence Kick

And it is equally difficult to draw a profile of the school prior to the excellence kick of President O. Meredith Wilson, whose administration gave birth to the Honors College and brought many outstanding faculty members.

The intervening years have also seen the development of Oregon's competitive bidding power for national research grants, thus bringing an even more distinguished faculty.

It seems incredible that anyone would want the University to regress back to the conditions of 1926, but unfortunately someone does. State Senator Walter Pearson, a Portland Democrat, who took his degree from the University in 1926.

A Dim View of Education

In the intervening years Senator Pearson has taken a dim view of the school's growth, which he believes is far beyond