

New Housing Regulations

The Office of Student Affairs has informed some 458 University students that they are living in unapproved housing. In an attempt to enforce an old regulation, the students have been informed that they have until next fall term to either move or have their landlords do something about getting their premises on the approved list.

This regulation is a clear infringement of liberty of the students living off-campus in the abrogation of their rights to choose where they wish to reside. Of course certain rights are always surrendered when one enters a given communal society, under the premise of protecting the individual from harsh and unjust treatment. But this ruling oversteps the bounds of protection and imposes a penalty not on the apartment landlord alone but also on the student.

The ruling is a basis for long and continued difficulties. Administrative problems will be endless. The University has no idea where a student is living until he has completed registration. A student that moves into an unapproved unit prior to registration will not be discovered until his address can be checked, at which time he will be told he cannot attend school and continue living in the unapproved dwelling. Of course if he is married or 21 or lives with relative in Eugene he is excepted from the rule. These items will have to be checked also. Registration will be delayed.

The landlords must sign a non-discrimination pledge and submit to an inspection by county health and safety officials in order to be placed on the approved list. It is idealistic to assume that all discrimination will be brought to a halt by invoking written pledges from proprietors. And it is unlikely that the dwellings of all students now pass all safety and health regulations required by the local government. Discrimination by race, religion or creed is illegal and cases are dealt with by the Oregon State Board of Labor, Civil Rights Division. The student has avenues of recourse through this agency; the University ruling

in this area is repetitive and unjust by denying enrollment to the student not in approved housing.

The University has attempted to move away from the sheltering "in loco parentis" concept of government through the student-oriented conduct program. The philosophy of the program assumes that the student will develop judgment and maturity necessary to become a responsible citizen. Such edicts as the housing regulation assume that the student is not able to determine criteria of a reasonable choice of residence. Instead of offering suggestions through the approved housing lists the student is given a command.

Another problem can be foreseen by simple logic. Given a not improbable situation, 3000 students could be given a choice of 2500 approved off-campus units. The surplus of 500 is offered a choice. The leftover students could live in dormitories, which are filled to the brim each fall term. They could live in Greek houses, financially not feasible for many, or in co-ops, which offer only limited openings. Or they could not attend school.

Students under 21 must get permission from their parents to live off-campus unless they are married or live with relatives in Eugene. The permission card does not now require listing the intended residences. If the proposed dwellings must be listed, which the administration has offered as a possibility, problems will arise for the student who does not rent a unit before his parents sign the card.

The new regulation does not fall under the Student Conduct Code now and unless it is incorporated into the code by next year, the student is offered no avenue of appeal. We feel the regulation is destined to create problems that do not now occur and will only aggravate minor situations of discriminatory policy that do exist at the present time. The administrative ruling should be reconsidered in light of these circumstances.

Rotating Meetings No Solution

The first ASUO Senate meeting of this term will be held in Dymont Hall, a freshman men's dormitory. Plans voiced in the last Senate meeting of fall term indicate that if the meeting proves "worthwhile" future meetings will be rotated among other "interested" living organizations. This plan is a faulty one, and should be rejected when it comes up for re-consideration in the Senate.

The idea of "rotating meetings" came up when the men of Dymont voted to extend an invitation on the Senate to hold a meeting in the dormitory dining room. Meetings are customarily held in room 101 of the Student Union, opposite the Post Office. Backers of the proposal said it was desirable because it would bring Senate members into closer contact with the students they represent, and it would give more students a chance to see the Senate in operation.

It would be fine if a way could be found to interest and involve more students in their government. But this is not the way to do it. Senate meetings are supposedly business meetings in which Senators deal with weighty problems, but anyone who has attended a dorm meeting knows how proceedings can deteriorate when irresponsible and uninterested elements are present. The bill passed by the Senate says, "Few students take the time or have the opportunity to witness a meeting . . ." Senate meetings are publicized prior to the meeting time, and the room number in which they are held is posted in the Student Union. A person who seriously wishes to attend a meeting can do so easily. Persons who would "take the time" to witness a

Senate meeting merely because it is a novelty are not likely to gain much; and the Senate is not likely to profit by their attendance. The ASUO Senate is a legislative body, not a circus.

Attendance at Senate meetings by the members themselves was not the best during fall term. One meeting even had to be adjourned due to lack of a quorum. And if the members must keep track of a schedule in order to know where the meeting is to be held each week, attendance is likely to be worse.

Another consideration, laughable as it may sound, should be the dignity of the Senate. An example of such a consideration may be seen in action taken, or rather not taken, by the Eugene City Council during the recent dispute over the cross on Skinner's Butte. The council refused to move from its regular chambers for the meeting in which the cross was to come up for discussion, even though they knew a huge crowd was sure to be present. The council members knew the kind of atmosphere which was likely to be generated by the topic at hand, and they realized the value of the dignity and stability lent to the council's proceedings by the existence and maintenance of a regular meeting place.

Although closer contact between Senators and constituents is a laudable goal, the rotation of Senate meetings is not a satisfactory means of achieving it. Likewise, any student who would seriously like to see the Senate in operation can do so easily under the present system. The Senate should vote down the "rotating meeting" proposal when it comes up for re-consideration.



"We Ought To Get Some Idea From The Cast"

Publish or Perish: Professor's Dilemma

By JACK APSPITZ and
ROBERT HOROWITZ
The Harvard Crimson
Collegiate Press Service

Two hundred Harvard students staged an angry rally recently to protest the dismissal of several popular young instructors.

The instructors were asked to leave the University for failing to meet departmental requirements of scholarly publication.

The controversy swirls around four teachers in the History of Religions Department who have published little.

Wrote Nothing

One, an assistant professor, taught a popular course in early Christianity, but wrote nothing. On mild days, he habitually shepherded his class to a small mountain for his lecture.

Departmental officials charged that the lectures were given in an unscholarly manner and amounted to little more than sermonizing. The faculty was also concerned about the professor's dubious parentage.

When questioned, the professor said only, "They know not what they do."

Another instructor, a bearded expert in Jewish theology, has composed only ten sentences while at the University. Even these, the department charges, were written by someone else. The instructor has been passed over for promotion several times.

95 Theses

The faculty also dismissed one of the department's more prolific members, whose work includes 95 theses. The department had complained that nailing theses to the instructor's office door did not constitute an acceptable mode of scholarly publication.

The final case in the religions department involves an instructor in oriental studies who spent much of his time sitting under a tree with his feet crossed, contemplating Holyoke Center.

"I have no desire for promotion. In fact, I have no desire," students quoted him as saying. His department charged "lack of initiative."

The controversy threatens to widen when the faculty takes up other cases next week. In some instances, failure to publish is coupled with other criticisms.

Classics Teacher

An instructor in the Classics Department, for example, well known for his course in the history of the Trojan War, has been charged with "lack of vision."

The most scandalous case, however, involves an instructor

in Greek philosophy. He is accused of copying all his published works, word for word, from casual comments made by a senior professor at cocktail parties.

This instructor is also suspected of being a monarchist. He allegedly planned an abortive coup in which members of the philosophy department sought to rule the University. Some students also hint that he invited the very youngest boys in his section to "wild parties."

One instructor of medieval theology, however, has been jumped to full professor. He recently completed a treatise of some 50 volumes on matters of the highest theological value. No senior faculty member has yet read the work, but all are greatly impressed by its table of contents and the cute review it received in the Crimson.

LETTER POLICY

All letters to the editor must be signed and must include the student's major and year in school. Letters from persons other than students must include the writer's address. Under ordinary conditions, no anonymous letters will be published. Letters will be run as room is available.

Letters under 300 words in length will be given priority for publication. If letters are signed by more than five persons only the first five names will be printed. The remaining signatures will be on file in the Emerald office. The Emerald reserves the right to cut, edit, or not to use any letters which it receives. Letters become the property of the Emerald and will be returned to the writer only upon request.

OREGON DAILY EMERALD

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published five times in September and five days a week during the academic year, except during examination 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 represent the opinions of the ASUO or the University.

Cathy Neville, Editor
J. Craig Mathiesen, Business Manager
Chuck Beggs, Managing Editor
Kenneth R. Kappel, Advertising Manager
Stephen Green, News Editor
Dave Jordan, Associate Editor
Phil Semas, Sports Editor
Phyllis Elving, Associate News Editor
Joe Frazier, Rich Babow, Assistant News Editors
Irma Dawn Moar, Associate Managing Editor
Bob Carl, Assistant Managing Editor
Nancy Collins, Entertainment Editor
Bob Denniston and Bruce McCurtain, Co-Photo Editors
Mary Stamp, Feature Editor