

# OREGON DAILY EMERALD

Opinions expressed on the editorial page are those of the Emerald and do not necessarily represent the opinions of the ASUO or the University. Opinions expressed in signed columns are those of the writer.

LOUIE ABRAMSON  
Business Manager  
MAXINE ELLIOTT  
News Editor

CHUCK BEGGS, Editor

BOB CARL  
Managing Editor  
PHIL SEMAS  
Associate Editor

WILBUR BISHOP, JR.  
Advertising Manager  
ALLEN BAILEY  
Associate Editor

Page 6

University of Oregon, Eugene, Thursday, January 20, 1966

## Unnecessary Baggage

The Student Conduct Committee's meddling into the "housekeeping" rules of individual dormitory units is a move only into confusion.

It is true that a few dormitory counselors have complained that they don't have enough power to enforce the internal regulations that are set up for the convenience of the residents. Internal rules such as phone duty are agreed upon by the students living in a given dormitory unit. The pressure from the majority of those students who agree upon these rules should render compliance from the dissenters.

The amendment to the Student Conduct Code passed by the Committee last week would allow each dormitory unit to decide if it wanted its housekeeping rules to fall under the Committee's jurisdiction. Thus, if a student refused phone duty, he could be sent to Student Court or, possibly, to the Committee for final decision. But, in order for the Committee to punish anyone in such a case, the individual dormitory rules would have to be approved for inclusion in the Code. The Code needs no excess baggage such as phone duty requirements

or dress standards in its regulations. Such rules are for each dormitory to decide for itself, not for general policy decisions in the operation of the conduct program.

The Committee's interference, further, will do little to enhance the student counselor relationship in the dormitories. The relationship is apparently not good to begin with if understandings cannot be reached without a third party mediating internal disagreements. Such friction would increase were the Committee to step into the situation.

Thus far only two dormitories out of 40 have complained of problems that might warrant the new amendment. Sure, the law must provide for everyone. But it already does. If things really do get out of hand, as we doubt is yet the case, all students are subject to the elastic regulation in the Code that makes an offense of interfering with the educational goals of the institution, or of obstructing other students' efforts to attain those goals.

The new amendment is an unnecessary burden on the administration of the conduct program.

## A Better Way

It's hard to argue with University President Arthur S. Flemming when he starts talking about the proposed School of Community Service and Public Affairs.

It's a fact that there is a shortage of city managers, urban planners, and people to run federal, state, and local agencies.

It's a fact that there is a shortage of social workers and especially of personnel to staff the burgeoning programs of President Johnson's War on Poverty.

It's a fact that there are many liberal arts majors at the University and elsewhere who don't know what they're going to do when they graduate.

It's a fact that there is no program at this University that concentrates on the public administration and community service fields.

What President Flemming has proposed as a solution to this problem is a new professional school: for community service and public affairs. This school would bring together courses from many areas, such as sociology, psychology, business, economics, etc., to come up with a degree program in public administration and one in community service. There would be few new faculty members hired and few new courses

added. It hasn't been decided yet whether these courses will remain under their own departments or whether they'll be taken out of those departments and put under administrative control of the new school.

When the faculty was asked to approve this new school they procrastinated. Why they decided to wait we don't know, since their meeting was not open to the press. They apparently withheld their approval because the meeting ran too late. But there was some discussion of the proposal and apparently some faculty members objected because the school's emphasis might be too vocational.

That's not the question we raise. Every professional school on this campus is "vocational." We wonder why there needs to be a new school established. There are to be few new courses or faculty members added. It seems silly—and expensive—to form a new school to administer courses that are already being administered by somebody else.

It would seem more logical to set up an inter-disciplinary program leading to degrees in public administration or community service.

## Letters to the Editor

### Responds to Riggs

Emerald Editor:

In response to Mr. Riggs' letter of Friday, January 14, criticizing, among other things, the recent visit to the University of Elizabeth Ashley and Frank Crowther:

I can and do sympathize with your anger at the Oregon Daily Emerald for their failure to announce Mr. Elman's concert. It's an old story . . . remember the almost total inattention paid by the Emerald when Robert Lowell read last year, and since then have consistently applied to the visits of Creeley, Kinnell and the others? But when you transfer your anger to Miss Ash-

ley and the purpose of her visit you are no closer to the target than the Emerald, and possibly more detrimental to the course of the arts than is the neglect of newsprint.

My main quarrel concerns your clever statement that "Miss Ashley came here for an absurd purpose, one that is contrary to the nature of the way American culture operates." I grant that her purpose, and the purpose of the National Council, is "contrary to the nature of the way American culture operates." And thank your god for that. American culture needs operating on. American Culture today is geared to reward mediocrity and discourage genius. Look at

Broadway. Look at the chances for serious playwrights, poets, artists, film-makers. Etc. Etc. I grant, Mr. Riggs, that Miss Ashley and her fellow members of the council aren't going to work any miracles, at least not just yet, and I grant further that the government being involved in the arts is not a perfect situation, but I ask you this: Who else is going to do it? Or would you rather retain the status quo, in which entertainment, pure and simple, is the rule and meaning hasn't got a prayer . . . and in which concerts aren't noted in college newspapers?

Miss Ashley is an entertainer, (Continued on page 7)

### Cameron's Comment



SAY MAN, WHO'S YOUR SIGNPAINTER?

Henry Drummonds

## Senate Should Take A Stand on Viet Nam

**Editor's Note:** At a Monday hearing before the ASUO Senate's Public Affairs Committee a group of Young Democrats objected to the Senate's plans to take a stand on Viet Nam and other non-campus issues. In this column the committee's chairman, Senator-at-large Henry Drummonds, defends the view that the Senate should take stands on issues like Viet Nam.

The ASUO Senate has both a right and an obligation to concern itself with certain so-called "off-campus issues."

In the first place, the term "off-campus" is a misnomer when applied to an issue like Viet Nam. The Viet Nam crisis is an issue on this campus. It is just simply not true that the things that students care most about are restricted to the realm of closing hours and dormitory food.

Indeed, in the last year no other issue has aroused as much interest on this campus as has Viet Nam. A flock of faculty and student groups have been formed which oppose or support in varying degrees American policy in Southeast Asia.

There have been almost constant panel discussions, debates, demonstrations, resolutions, telegrams, symposiums, and marches concerning the Viet Nam question.

In short, the University community is already deeply involved in Viet Nam. And it should be. Where else but in a major university with a long and proud tradition in the liberal arts and free speech should the complexities of American Southeast Asian policy be pondered and worried over and examined?

Whether a student feels the U.S. should drop an H-bomb on Hanoi, whether he feels the U.S. should "get out" of Viet Nam immediately, whether he feels the U.S. should escalate the war further, or whether he feels the U.S. should seek more vigorously "a cease fire and negotiations"—every student has a stake in Viet Nam and an obligation to recognize that stake.

And so does the Senate. Does the Senate have a right to draft a resolution on Viet Nam after extended debate and a genuine effort to seek student opinion? I believe it does.

In the first place the student body president of the University, Steve Goldschmidt, and many present ASUO senators campaigned and were elected on platforms that included extending the scope of campus politics to include issues like Viet Nam.

Secondly, almost one third of the Senate will be elected during the next three weeks before the Senate votes on any resolution on Viet Nam.

Lastly, although the Senate is admittedly an imperfect instrument for expressing student opinion, it is the best one available.

But if the Viet Nam crisis is an issue on this campus and if the Senate does have a right and responsibility to concern itself with it, the question remains—what can the Senate accomplish by considering an issue like Viet Nam?

That's a fair question and one that should be asked. It would be naive for the Senate and students of this University to expect a shotgun ASUO resolution on American Viet Nam policy to have any manifest impact on the State Department, Pentagon, or the White House. But to recognize that fact does not mean that the Senate can accomplish nothing.

For one thing, by concerning itself with issues like Viet Nam, the Senate can more adequately insure that University delegates to the National Student Association congress represent the views of the students of the University.

The Senate can also bring into focus an issue that many students care about more than any "local problem." And that is what a students' senate should do!

The Senate can also bring student groups like the Young Democrats, Young Republicans, Students for a Democratic Society, and Young Americans for Freedom into the same room to talk about a (Continued on page 7)