

editorial Coming of age

One of the remaining vestiges of the in loco parentis philosophy at the University may be going the way of chaperoned dances and evening curfew checks. The question of legal-age drinking in the dorms was discussed Wednesday at a meeting of the Student University Affairs Board (SUAB). In addition, an ad hoc committee, composed of dorm residents and dorm government members, has been formed to investigate the issue.

Already Oregon State University (OSU) has lifted its ban against legal-age consumption of alcohol in the dorms. It is ironic that the OSU administration, which is more closely associated with the tenets of in loco parentis, should be a step ahead of the University in this area.

The rationale of in loco parentis dictates that the University has an obligation to control and supervise the activities of students in much the same manner their parents would. Since the late 1960s, there has been a growing realization that such activities may not be the proper function of the University.

The problem is that the use of this philosophy to prohibit drinking in the dorms discriminates against students of legal age merely on the basis of where they live.

In addition, the arguments that close physical proximity of residences and the need to control noise levels requires prohibition does not hold water when one considers that apartment dwellers are faced with the same situation and are able to cope with it.

In fact, discipline problems arising from alcohol use could be more easily handled in dorms than apartments. Drinking-related problems in apartments usually have to be handled by the police and managers. Dorm violators could face sanctions by floor advisers, campus security, dorm councils and the Student Conduct Committee. Discipline problems could be further avoided by creating an "over-21" dorm. Students registering a preference for this type of dorm would be voluntarily entering a setting that allowed alcohol consumption.

For too long now the University, by prohibiting legal-age drinking, has played the role of baby-sitter. It's time that both students and the University came of age.



More from Les

By Leslie Zaitz

Bounce and grin



Jack Craig the politician reminds you of a clown-faced punching bag that bounces back up, still grinning, each time you knock it over.

Craig is an old Lane County Democratic warhorse who has run for what seems to be every available office since 1966. He's been beaten four times and each time comes back, still slapping people on the back, grinning, readying for another try.

Craig is now bouncing back from a 1974 loss to Republican State Sen. George Wingard and is on the run, this time wanting to move from the county assessor's office into Frank Elliott's county commissioner seat.

We talked with some of Craig's closest political allies and a few detractors to find out what makes the guy tick politically. He's an interesting case study. Opinions, of course, are mixed. Some say he has trained himself for the political life while others say he just sort of stumbled into it and is still learning.

Never one to be taken very seriously by Democratic regulars, Craig is now making some of them nervous. His soft-sell approach to easing people into his corner, coupled with his unheralded penchant for political statistical analysis, is causing some people to shift uneasily in their chairs.

The man doesn't give up. After graduating from the University with a journalism degree he bounced around for 20 years between almost every newspaper, radio station and television station.

In 1966, he went public, so to speak, by seeking a county commission slot. He lost by 400 votes.

He tried again in 1968 and lost.

In 1970, Craig met success. He was elected Oregon House Dist. 40 representative. (Local Democrats, pressed to explain that win, just scratch their heads.)

Success went out with the 1972 reapportionment which put Craig and Rep. Larry Perry in the same district. Perry moved to another district. Or so he thought. He hadn't quite moved far enough (raising more than a few political eyebrows) and Craig decided not to make it a messy fight.

In 1972, he lost a primary bid for a commissioner slot.

Political mentor Dick Eymann summoned him to Salem to work in the House speaker's office. In 1974, Craig tried and failed to defeat Republican Wingard.

He also lost his state paycheck that year when Eymann was beaten. Craig didn't hesitate when new County Assessor Ken Bylund offered him a job as administrative assistant, a job he still holds. (Ironically, Bylund supported Craig's primary op-

ponent, Bill Garrett, in that 1974 senate race.)

Political associates say Craig is now a pure political animal. Everything he does, everything he says, it seems, is geared to eventually winning a vote.

He has strong symbolic ties with campus. Wife Barbara is daughter of former University Pres. Donald Erb.

A few Democrats skeptical of Craig say he catches a lot of people off guard with his soft-sell tactics. Those skeptics attribute Craig with a calculating mind that translates compliments into votes.

He has practically fooled himself into thinking his sole interest in a government job is to serve the people. Close friends are adamant in saying Jack Craig is interested in serving the public, not Jack Craig. They won't be convinced otherwise.

Appearance, all-important to the ambitious politician, practically works against Craig. He's been compared in makeup to an unmade bed. But underneath that rumpled appearance, Craig is constantly figuring how to get the upper hand. Stacks and stacks of voter turnout results sit on his desk at home. He attends hours and hours of citizen advisory committee meetings.

He is a creature of public opinion. If he were put in a vacuum tube with some facts and told to make a decision, some doubt he could do it. Without the sign posts of public opinion, he doesn't move.

Critics say you get a hollow ring when you knock on Craig's viewpoints. He adopts a shallow position for the moment it will serve, they like to contend. Craig doesn't do much to dispel those impressions.

In the upcoming election, Craig will start trading in those pats on the back and morale boosts for contributions and political support. In 20 years of superactive involvement in Democratic politics, he has built up plenty of redeemable favors.

Though they may not be enamored with the idea, those Democrats will have to help him. Among other things, that's what makes Craig confident about his latest foray into the political circus.

He says he will run for county commissioner, not against Frank Elliott. Why Elliott? Because Elliott has rural, government-hands-off philosophy while Craig is oriented to the liberal, urban way of thinking.

Besides, says Craig, he couldn't challenge Nancy Hayward. They think too much alike (though with some wide disagreements). Besides, their kids grew up together and went to the same schools, Craig said in an interview.

Some people would feel cheated if Craig didn't run for some office every two years. When he does run, they chuckle and swap Craig jokes.

But this year, with that ever-present smile and a pocketful of political IOUs, Craig could have the last laugh...from a county commissioner's office.

Letters— Abuses sought

Over the past few years we have been sending press releases to the *Emerald* concerning the Church of Scientology's activities. The Church here in Portland has concentrated on the Portland area in relation to uncovering the abusive practices of police dossiers and psychiatric abuses such as electro shock "therapy." We now have the resources and manpower to expand our investigation to other Oregon areas. As such we will be seeking individuals in the Eugene area who feel they have been or are being abused by false police dossiers which may contain information of arrest for a crime but fail to state the individual was not found guilty, or a person who has looked for help at one of our psychiatric institutions only to receive electro shock and possible brain damage.

We will also be seeking the signatures of Eugene residents on various petitions which will be turned over to our Senators. It is vital that all people make their voice heard if our country is to remain the democracy which it is.

Steve Tiger
Portland, Oregon

Time to realize

On Thursday, Feb. 12, the Campus YWCA and Office of Life Long Learning held an informal lunch at the Faculty Club at which Ruth Burns, associate director of Financial Aid, discussed financial assistance for older students; stu-

dents who have been away from the University for a while or students who are supporting themselves and/or a family. One week prior to this, a press release was submitted to the *Emerald*. Alas, no article appeared in the *Emerald* about this meeting (We did submit a brief, as well, which was printed.) Other programs of interest to "non-traditional students" seem to suffer similar lack of coverage as well.

It is time for the *Emerald* to realize that although the typical student may be a white, 20-year-old male there are a whole range of students who do not fit this stereotype and who are entitled to a full range of coverage and recognition, older students are one such group. We submit to the *Register Guard*, *Springfield News*, *Willamette Valley Observer*, but it is distressing that it is the community papers which must be relied on to carry University-related news.

Melinda Grier
Executive Director, YWCA

Answer loud

I hope that you will print this letter from a man who attended last Saturday night's Stanford-Oregon basketball game with his 17-year-old daughter, who had been seriously thinking of enrolling at your school. I write not out of sour grapes or prudishness, but to let you know what a poor impression the visiting Oregon students and team made on so many of us here.

We sat near a group of Oregon students, one of who kept shouting obscenities at the Stanford team throughout the game. Finally I turned and asked him if he would

please stop. His answer was loud, clear and to the point: "F--- you."

As for the Oregon team, it engaged in some of the most brutal tactics I have ever seen in that sport. Its members did not merely try to block a shot by a Stanford player; they seemed intent on injuring him in the process. The Oregon coach inserted expendable players into the game whose main job appeared to be that of

hurling elbows and fists to goad Stanford players into retaliating and drawing fouls. What was once primarily a game of skill and speed has been transformed by Oregon into an ugly street brawl.

When the game was over, my daughter turned to me and said, "You know, I don't think I want to go there." I told her it would be wrong to judge a school by such

isolated incidents, and she knows that, but the impression of vulgarity and brutality was formed. Equally sad is the fact that such an impression is completely contrary to the one I had always held of your institution.

Andrew Doty
Palo, Alto, Calif.

Tuesday, February 24, 1976