

Keep Talking

Opportunities for Discussion are Necessary

A new concept in informal University discussion will be attempted this weekend when the Oregon Assembly holds its first meeting. The assembly, composed of students, faculty members and administrators, will meet to discuss student responsibility and the University's role in giving students the opportunity to exercise mature and responsible ideas. Coming on the heels of the Berkeley demonstrations, this discussion has perhaps taken on added meaning.

The assembly is new this year. It has apparently replaced the academic retreats, held several times a term for the past two years. While the assembly provides some of the same opportunities for discussion and reflection that was provided by the retreats, we are sorry to see the latter program apparently abandoned.

The retreats were held apart from the campus and usually extended overnight. Participating students were given a list of books or publications to read before the retreat. The discussion was then on some general topic for which the books provided background. Faculty members and administrators participated in each discussion.

Topics for discussion ranged over a broad area, from specific problems to broad, philosophical questions. The retreats were small, with only a limited number of students allowed to sign up for any given weekend.

Admittedly, the Oregon Assembly does serve very much the same purpose as the retreats did. However, because of the size of the group participating in the first assembly (and hopefully in succeeding evening sessions) assembly programs must be carefully scheduled at times when the greatest number of interested individuals can attend. One advantage of the retreats was that because of their limited size they could be held frequently, involving varied groups of students and faculty members.

Since both programs have merit, there is no reason to assume that one must replace the other. Both could be held at different times throughout the year, involving an increasing number of students and faculty members in the type of discussion which gives meaning to a university. The academic retreats have not been held so far this year. We hope this does not mean that a good program which has proved itself in the past has been abandoned.

Berkeley, Part II

The Faculty Role at UC

By CATHY NEVILLE
Emerald Editor

One encouraging sidelight of the semester-long disturbances at the University of California has been a resurgence of faculty interest in student life and teaching at that University.

"For the first time, the faculty genuinely understood some of the undergraduate frustration at the situation," one University staff member observed.

The frustration he referred to is the size of the University, in many cases the lack of personal contact with faculty members, and the unfortunate situation in which many professors find themselves devoting a great deal of time to preparing research papers for publication rather than teaching.

As a result of the Free Speech Movement, faculty members found themselves asking to be given some responsibility for student discipline, a function which the faculty had gladly given up several decades ago.

Legislature Ruled

When UC was founded by the State Legislature, disciplinary powers were vested in the faculty. In 1921, at the request of the faculty, the situation was revised and power over discipline was given to administrators with the Board of Regents retaining final authority in all disciplinary matters.

In the now famous Dec. 8 motion passed by the Academic Senate, the faculty asked by a vote of 824 to 115:

"That future disciplinary measures in the area of political activity shall be determined by a committee appointed by and responsible to the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate."

Although the Board of Regents subsequently declared that they will not delegate disciplinary authority to the faculty, giving the faculty only advisory power over student discipline, the fact remains that in reassessing its role the faculty was willing to accept a greater responsibility for the student community.

Loss of Contact

But the question of faculty involvement in student discipline is not the major one at Berkeley. As the dispute developed throughout the fall months, some faculty members were genuinely surprised to see the intensity of student desires. To many, it brought home the real-

ization that contact with undergraduate students had been only limited and that the desires and nature of the undergraduate student body were unknown to many faculty members. Faculty dedication to teaching had unfortunately been weakened by the pressure to do scholarly research.

"At the last faculty meeting there was a marvelous feeling of resolve and of a new commitment to action and to teaching," one faculty member observed.

Faculty participation in the dispute came slowly. Some teaching assistants had been involved early in the dispute but all action had been on a personal basis. The first formal faculty participation came when the tri-part committee was formed Oct. 2 to discuss student demands.

Faculty Role

From this point on, the faculty role became increasingly important in the discussions. Feelings ran high within the faculty, as they did within every other segment of the University during the days of agitation,

but the faculty continued to act as a mediator in the action.

One major point of friction came when the Heyman committee, appointed by the Senate to advise President Clark Kerr on disciplining the eight students, indefinitely suspended in the first days of the dispute. The committee recommended that the students be reinstated pending a hearing and further study of the situation. The request was denied by Chancellor Edward Strong.

At the time the request was denied, the tri-part committee was still meeting to discuss the student demands. Negotiations in this committee had broken down when student leaders, impatient with an apparent impasse concerning the right of students to advocate action which might result in illegal acts (civil disobedience). Administrative representatives on the committee contended that the University should reserve the right to discipline students for illegal acts advocated on the campus.

The student position, in op-

Chronology of Events On Berkeley Campus

Some of the complexities of the Berkeley situation may be clarified by presenting the events in a brief chronology. The following is developed from a record of events prepared by two faculty members at the University of California and another by the Public Information office.

June—During the Republican National Convention, the San Francisco Chronicle reported that charges had been made that Scranton supporters were illegally recruiting student volunteers on campus.

Sept. 4—Picketing of the Oakland Tribune by a group which recruited support on the Berkeley Campus.

Sept. 14—Dean of Students Katherine Towle issued statement banning posters, easels, and tables at the Bancroft-Telegraph gate to the campus and reminded students of "rules prohibiting the collection of funds and use of University facilities for planning and implementing off campus political and social action."

Sept. 17-18—United Front is formed among 20 student organizations. The group asks Dean Towle to reconsider decision.

Sept. 21—Bancroft-Telegraph area restored for distributing

informational literature but prohibition of advocacy or organization of political and social action remains. Students hold first rally on steps of administration building, Sproul Hall.

Sept. 28—Chancellor of the Berkeley campus Edward Strong allows distribution of campaign literature and similar material at designated locations. Students picket the meeting at which Strong announces this policy change and set up tables advocating political and social action in an effort to make a test case concerning the University's rule prohibiting advocacy.

Sept. 30—Five students cited by dean for illegally manning tables. 400 students sign statement declaring joint guilt. Eight students indefinitely suspended, students stage sit-in until 3 a.m. in Sproul hall.

Oct. 1—Tables set up in front of Sproul hall. Jack Wineberg, a former student, arrested. Students surround police car, remain for 36 hours.

Oct. 2—Police assemble on campus, car still surrounded. Administrators, faculty members and students agree to a six-point truce. Demonstrations end.

Oct. 3, 4—Free Speech Movement organized under that name.

Oct. 13—Academic Senate (faculty) passes motion favoring "maximum freedom for student political activity."

Oct. 15—President Clark Kerr asks Academic Senate to establish ad hoc committee to advise on disciplining the eight suspended students. (Heyman Committee).

Oct. 21—Heyman Committee requests Chancellor temporarily reinstate suspended students pending hearing and report. Request denied.

Nov. 5—Picketing resumes.

Nov. 9—FSM rally on Sproul steps. Tables set up again. University officials take names of some students, 800 sign joint guilt statements.

Nov. 10—Chancellor Strong dissolves administrative-faculty-student committee because FSM has resumed demonstrations.

Nov. 20—Regents accept recommendation for suspension of eight students and placing Savio and Art Goldberg on probation. Regents also agree to modify policy on political activity, stating that lawful off-campus involvement may be organized in designated areas on campus. Students advocating unlawful action will be subject to University discipline.

Nov. 22—FSM sit-in for three hours in Sproul over issue of University discipline for off-campus activity.

Nov. 25-30—Disciplinary action proposed against students who have participated in demonstrations. Teaching assistants threaten strike.

Dec. 1—FSM demands University drop charges, asserting only courts have the right to regulate

(Continued on page 3)

Regents Meet

At this point the Board of Regents met again, accepting recommendations for suspending the eight students and modifying their policy to allow "lawful off-campus action" to take place on University property.

Since the faculty could not get the Regents to accept their informal policy of not limiting the content of speech on campus through the administration, it would become an official faculty position.

On December 8 the Academic Senate recommended 1) no disciplinary measures against members organizations for activities prior to Dec. 8; 2) that time, place and manner be the only regulations and that these regulations be made only to prevent interference with the normal functions of the University; 3) that the content of speech not be restricted; 4) that a faculty committee be made responsible for future disciplinary measures in the area of political activity; and that peace be restored.

With some modification, the faculty's position has been the final course followed by discussions.

Students Want Role

One generalization drawn about the situation by a staff member is "students are demanding a role in the educational community, not the solution to a specific problem."

"We now have a different breed of student than we have in the past. Intellectually they are more mature; emotionally—probably not."

"There was a time when student pranks or disorders were tolerated to a great degree. As students have become more sophisticated, the community has become more intolerant. Before, there was always the suspicion that nothing really bad would happen."

Raccoon coats were funny, beards aren't.



"This Is The Great Society?"

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 and Rich Babow, Associate News Editors
Irma Dawn Moar, Associate Managing Editor
Bob Carl, Assistant Managing Editor
Steve Dimeo, Entertainment Editor
Bob Denniston, Photo Editor
Mary Stamp, Feature Editor
Editorial Board: Pam Bladine, Clifford Kaufman, Pat Holt, Stephen Green, Irma Dawn Moar, Steve Goldschmidt, Chuck Beggs, Dave Jordan, Phil Semas, Karen Winn, Bob Carl.