

Another Step Forward

Summer Courts and New Selection System Strengthen Courts

The Student court which will be in session during the summer term and the further clarification of the selection system for minor courts should strengthen the court system and increase student confidence in the Conduct Code.

The summer court will be composed of five students and two faculty members as is the court which meets during the regular school year. Under the new court selection system, one candidate will be elected from each dormitory unit with the added stipulation that any student not elected as a court candidate may apply for a position. After nominations and applications have been received, a screening committee will review all candidates, making a list of those acceptable for service on the courts.

The names of students accepted by the screening process will be submitted to the Student Conduct Committee and ultimately to the University President for approval. The code makes no stipulation that the student body president must approve court members. Since students have a major role in selecting the court members both through the screening committee and through the conduct committee, approval by the student body president would seem to be only an additional rubber stamp.

When current courts were made up, students were elected from each unit and then complex courts were made up. The committee's indecision over the exact procedure for selecting court members and the length of time before they were chosen caused some reservations on the part of dorm students and recommendations and records were not gathered carefully in all cases. The new system would have the court members chosen and ready to begin work as soon as fall term begins.

Adding a body to decide discipline questions during the summer months fills another weak spot in enforcement of the code.

The complex courts have established some precedents during the past year. Another major need of the minor court system is a uniform set of punishment recommendations to govern sanctions handed out by each court. Such recommendations should not be inelastic but should rather recommend limits for maximum and minimum sanctions for common offense.

The courts are proving themselves through a long process of trial, hesitation and error. With more attention to assure equal sanctions and trial procedures in the courts student acceptance, now increasing, should become more widespread.

A Strong Stand?

J. Francyl Howard, the ever-vocal editor of Albany's Greater Oregon, discussed Friday's primary election and particularly ballot Measure Number One in last week's paper. Howard was the author of the October 15 referendum, the effects of which are still being felt by higher education in Oregon.

On the left side of last week's front page, Howard states that he sincerely feels Oregon needs the \$30 million that will be provided if the ballot measure succeeds and supports the measure. In the next story he is not as sure, qualifying his endorsement with a long consideration of the finances involved. In the story appearing on the right hand side of the front page Howard assures his readers that they cannot be stampeded into making a rash decision. He then announces that, if he gets signed statements from legislators vowing that they will not allow taxes to be raised as a result of the ballot measure, he will support the issue. Tune in next week to see which side of the fence the "Friend of Higher Education" finally falls off of.

Where the Money Goes

Many Forces Influence Scholarship Awards

A recent study by the American Council on Education has discovered that for every scholarship awarded annually to college students from families with incomes below the \$3,000 level, at least four were awarded to students from families in the \$11,000 bracket. While the study may overlook some basic considerations such as the comparative number of students entering colleges and universities from the lower income bracket, the study does point to some disturbing trends in scholastic aid.

Elmer West, director of the AEC research project, found that many large schools try to balance their enrollment among all areas of the country by segregating scholarships. While Americans differ in dialect and some general attitudes from region to region, the values to an institution of higher education of having such a geographically diversified student body are indistinct at best. One further consideration here, however, is that students from low income backgrounds frequently do not apply to larger and more expensive schools, possibly destroying the argument that financial need is not considered as a major factor in awarding scholarships.

A scholarship represents not only financial aid but also serves as a measure of recognition for scholastic achievement. For this reason, students from higher income families feel the need to compete for schol-

arships even when funds might be available from other sources. Low interest student loans are available and do not represent a great financial burden to the student who, although attempting to put himself through school, can fall back on parental assistance when necessary. The research report suggested awarding separate types of scholarships, one for competitive students seeking recognition and another for needy students. Such a program might be applicable to larger institutions with more funds available for such grants than most state institutions enjoy.

These are questions that must be pondered by scholarship officers at colleges and universities throughout the country. The fact remains that nearly 40 percent of all students from families below the \$8,000 income bracket who apply for scholarship aid are denied this assistance. Students generally eliminate themselves before applying for such aid if they are academically deficient. It is fairly safe to assume that each of the thousands of students applying for financial aid each year deserves the opportunity to attend an accredited college or university. It is also clear that funds are not available for this type of financial aid. Current federal legislation such as the Hartke bill now being considered by congress and existing programs such as the National Defense Education Act are steps in the right direction.

Herblock



"I'll Get You In There If It Kills You"

Letters to the Editor

Kirsch Questioned

Emerald Editor:

I'm glad to hear that baseball coach Don Kirsch likes to write "informative letters" to his players. I'm sure his critical research of deriving information from "various sources" was in the best intent, however it seems to me he should have validated his obsequious conclusions by talking to the respective candidates. Perhaps his was a leaping without looking situation.

Possibly Mr. Kirsch's sense of ethics is different than mine, for he said in defense that "there was no coercion in the letter;" yet the letter clearly stated, "I think it is very important that you and your friends who are interested in the athletic program get out and vote tomorrow for Luvaas." If this isn't coercion, then no such thing exists.

Granted the letter was the fallacious appeal to authority, but it could, and did, influence many voters. The letter was delivered on election day (which by the way, is prohibited by campaign statute) and therefore the misinformation it contained couldn't be rectified.

I bet you're "not particularly happy to be involved in this thing," Mr. Kirsch. Anyone who acted as you did wouldn't want to be caught—it's only natural.

Steve Ashton
Senator-at-Large, elect

Concerning Scandal

Emerald Editor:

In regard to the punishment of the 30 male University stu-

dents for their supposedly lewd and immoral conduct with a 13 year old girl, I feel that a punishment as severe as expulsion would be extremely wrong. In the first place being expelled from the University for violation of a morals clause in the conduct code, would not only ruin these young mens' chances of being admitted to another university, but also their chances of finding a position which would be equal to their qualifications.

In the world today sex is a very open and too often talked of subject. The fact that a 13 year old girl, mentally disturbed or not, would plan associations with so many men is not so terribly hard to believe. One must take into consideration that the rate of venereal disease is highest between the ages of 11 and 14. I am not condoning the behavior of the students or the girl in this matter, but I feel that to ruin the lives of 30 boys because of something which no normal healthy boy would turn down when practically offered to him on a silver platter, would show the narrowmindedness of a society that is supposed to try and help keep such situations from occurring.

Thank you
Penny White,
Freshman

Brief Deadline

Students are reminded that the deadline for placing campus briefs is 4 p.m. on the day before they are to appear in the Emerald.

Letters to Editor Policy Statement

Letters to the editor are due in The Emerald Office, 301 Allen Hall, by noon of the day prior to publication. Priority is given to shorter letters.

Letters should not exceed 250 words and should bear the name, status and address of the writer. The Emerald accepts letters from anyone but gives priority to those letters from members of the University community or of direct concern to the University.

All letters should be typewritten and double spaced. Names of writers can be withheld upon request. Letters bearing names of more than five persons are run with only the first name on the list. Other names are kept on file in the editor's office.

The Emerald reserves the right to edit letters.

OREGON DAILY EMERALD

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published twice in September and five days a week during the academic 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.

CATHY NEVILLE, Editor
J. CRAIG MATHIESEN, Business Manager
IRMA DAWN MOAR, Managing Editor
MARIE FORRESTER, Advertising Manager
STEPHEN GREEN, News Editor
CHUCK BEGGS, Editorial Page Editor
PHIL SEMAS, Sports Editor
DAVE JORDAN, Associate Editor
PHYLLIS ELVING, MARY STAMP, Assistant News Editors
JOE FRAZIER, NOMI BORENSTEIN, Associate News Editors
THORA WILLIAMS, Feature Editor
Editorial Board: Steve Goldschmidt, Pam Bladine, Jim Pennington, Clifford Kauffman, Pat Holt, Lynn Mascall, Stephen Green, Irma Dawn Moar, Chuck Beggs, Dave Jordan, and Phil Semas.