

SANDSCRIPT

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO
Volume I Number 8 1 April, 1965

HONOR SYSTEM? ASSEMBLY FRIDAY

It was necessary to cancel last Friday's freshman assembly due to the emotional disruption of students caused by the long-awaited math test. Many students resorted to an immediate exodus to the beach, while others merely went home to grieve and suffer. Evidence of this attitude was seen in the new attendance record set that day at the 1:00 physics lecture.

Because of the importance of this planned assembly, it seemed better to postpone the meeting rather than meet with a handful of interested students. The assembly has been re-scheduled for this coming Friday, April 2, at 12:00, in the physics lecture room. The purpose of this group meeting is to discuss the Honor Spirit at UCSD and consider its future applications and merits. Perhaps it will be necessary to revise the judicial procedures of our campus regarding the much-debated Honor Spirit. These matters must be handled by the students themselves. A special committee shall be created at this time, Friday, for the purpose of investigating the Honor System and recommending action to the UCSD Senate for approval.

I have heard many comments and criticisms concerning the Honor System in its present form, so put these comments to use by participating in this important assembly. Contribute.

Larry Baker, AS President

BEACH PARTY

The Freshman of MSA are sponsoring a night Beach Party and Hootenanny--Sunday, April 4, from 6:30 p.m. on. UCSD students and friends are invited. The party will be held at Scripps on the beach in front of the student center. Food will be provided.

MAY 1, BEACH PARTY

The ASUCSD is planning its first major event of the spring season in the form of a beach party on Saturday, May 1. The party is designed in the same spirit as the summer parties held before school began. All prospective UCSD students (next year's incoming Frosh, Soph. and Juniors) are being invited for what should be their first social introduction to campus life. Food will be made available by a AS sponsored refreshment stand, all donations going into the AS treasury. Let's all plan to attend and give social life a large boost at UCSD. We can all have fun for a change, too. This one won't be cancelled.

Larry Baker, AS President

ANYONE FOR RUSSIAN ORTHODOXY?

Priest to Speak at Campus Church

Father Hilary, bearded and vested in black, will speak on, "The Faith of Russian Orthodoxy," this Thursday, April 1, at University Lutheran Student Center. The program begins at 5:45, but all students, staff and townspeople are also invited to dinner at 5 p.m., for only 50¢ (including tax and tip).

The speaker will present a case for the eastern tradition of Christendom, and will also provide current information about church life in the Soviet Union. Fr. Hilary serves the Holy Virgin Mary Russian Orthodox Church in Los Angeles.

Campus Pastor John George Huber announced that both freshmen and graduate students are turning out in congenial numbers for Dialogue-in-Depth. "It's still a mystery," he noted, "that more attended the program on, 'Existentialism in Theological Perspective,' than, 'Sex Life at UCSD.'"

THE RIVERSIDE QUESTION

"Student governments are established by the University for the purpose of conducting student affairs on the campuses. Students with widely varying political, religious, and economic views give them financial support; hence it is certainly not appropriate to permit student body governments to speak either for the University or the student body with reference to the off-campus political, religious, economic, and international issues of the times. Therefore student governments and their subsidiary agencies may not take positions on any such off-campus issue..." -Excerpt from what are commonly known as the "Kerr directives."

Last week the UCR student Executive Committee passed a resolution, calling for Federal intervention in the Selma, Alabama crisis. The resolution was proposed by a student group at Riverside called SCRAP (Student Committee at Riverside against Prejudice) which was active in the fight against Proposition 13 last November. The motion was passed by a vote of 8-4 by the Executive Committee and took the form of a telegram to President Johnson.

In the ensuing scramble, student opinion was split down the middle as to whether the resolution, in direct violation of the Kerr directives should be rescinded. Many of the Riverside students felt that while they voted for the members of the Executive Committee to represent them in student affairs, that the same "representation" could not be an accurate indication of student sentiment on off-campus issues.

Within the few days after the resolution was passed, the student Judicial Council declared it unconstitutional. The administration demanded, upon threat of suspending the activities of the Executive Committee for the remainder of the semester, that the resolution be rescinded. In a subsequent meeting, after which 6 members of the Executive Committee (including UCR Student Body President, Bob Holcomb) resigned, the resolution was withdrawn after a 9-0 vote with 4 abstentions.

Holcomb subsequently appeared on the Joe Pyne TV show to present his case, last Saturday evening. Holcomb felt that the particular sections of the Kerr directives with which the Executive

Committee was in violation should be reconsidered by the "All-University" administration. He could not see how these restrictions on student governments in off-campus issues were justified. Holcomb said that these regulations had been under fire for several years at UCR and nothing had been done about them. Holcomb was undoubtedly convinced that the resignations would call attention to the issue. This would suggest that the appropriate Regents Committee, the Meyer Committee, might have a bit of "work" ahead of them.

Some Riverside students doubt that Holcomb should have attacked the problem in this way. No one disagrees with the moral and humanitarian issues with which the student Senate resolution was sympathetic. The question is simply the latitude in which student governments should be allowed to operate. This issue is indicative of the problems arising in administering the new student "freedoms" which the FSM touched off. We are looking to see better answers to the questions than now exist.

Mark Hinderaker, Editor

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

(Re: Sandscript, Mar. 19, pp. 7-8)

To John Pratola, S.E.:

I do appreciate the non-fathering advice contained in your reply to Dr. Watson's letter. It was only half-effective coming as it did from a freshman. It is unfortunate that you missed the entire point of the laws against fornication and prostitution. For this Dr. Watson must share at least half the blame. Apparently, your reply reflected your angry frame of mind after reading his letter, and only caused confusion among its readers concerning the difference between good principle and your actual intent. Dr. Watson should apologize and try to rectify the situation, Mr. Pratola, at least attempting to calm your poor upset little id.

The basis of your letter, that is, your apparent love of individualism and freedom of choice, even in the field of sex relations, is highly commendable. However, the rest of the letter is, at best, ridiculous. May I suggest that to prevent popular confusion between sound individualism and absurdities such as your impractical contentions, that you shut up. Ordinarily, I am not one to squelch free speech. But I cannot bear to see good ideas, which I wholeheartedly support, mixed with statements such as are found in your letter.

Just because Aldous Huxley proposed free sex, and made it look easy, Mr. Pratola, doesn't make it a good idea. You seem to forget, Mr. Pratola, that he also proposed a number of other ideas, among them government-mass-produced children, which went hand in hand with free sex. After all, without laws against fornication, who, if not you, Mr. Pratola, will want the responsibility of parenthood? Society must have some system, Mr. Pratola, by means of which it maintains itself. As you, yourself, said, Mr. Pratola, "...society for its own protection, must exercise some control...." If not against its own extinction, against what?

I agree that the pressure of modern society to make the individual conform should be lessened. I agree that our Christian systems of morals and ethics could well stand some revision and improvement. As you say, we don't know that these systems are the best for mankind. But we do know how effective they are; they do work. And I think that is more than one can say for the systems that you propose.

Yes, in our society social problems do exist, Mr. Pratola. But I'm afraid that jumping half-heartedly into Brave New World would create far more problems than it would solve. For Ford's sake, Mr. Pratola!

Although the seriousness of some of the above must be assessed, the statements are not presented in an entirely jesting manner.

David F. Willoughby,
P.O.M.A.S.U.C.S.D.

From The President

What are the purposes and functions of student government? Basically, student government is designed for the benefit of the students themselves by developing qualities of leadership, responsibility, and authority. Through student government, students learn to organize themselves and take an active part in planning activities, as well as voice their opinions and expressions through organized channels. Student government organizes students into groups of interest and affords these groups the opportunity of activity and support. Student government also serves to link the faculty and administration to the students themselves, serving as an effective mode of communication. Student leaders express student opinions, thus serving as a representative voice for student opinion.

Often, student government is criticized and condemned for not effectively serving its function. Many claim that student leaders represent exclusive organizations and lack the ability to identify themselves with people outside these groups. (For example, the "Greeks" hold a strong influence in student government). Student government cannot be condemned on the basis of this argument. Improvement is necessary and can be obtained through a wider association of students from all aspects of college life. At UCSD, this is difficult because of lack of strength due to the numbers problem which continues to plague our freshman class. If student want to be organized and represented by a government such as the ASUCSD, they must support it and continue to build it. If students don't want it, they must get rid of it.

In view of this fact, and recognizing the need to have a functioning student representative body, I propose a review of present organization and an investigation of our goals and purposes as a student body organization. Next week I plan to call a joint meeting of all branches of ASUCSD officers (executive, legislative and judicial) for the purpose of emphasizing direction. We must know where we are going before we can get there.

Larry Baker, AS President

80

We are grateful to Mr. Michael Stone and Mr. Al Green for their invitation for us to clarify the role of linguistics in the freshman curriculum. As Mr. Stone correctly points out, the freshman language program is divided into two parts: (1) language study designed to lead to the acquisition of basic oral and literacy skills in a modern foreign language, and (2) freshman linguistics, an introduction to the basic concepts of modern general linguistics. So far there seems to be general satisfaction with most features of the foreign language study, although a misunderstanding about the purpose of the Weekly Language Learning Record sheets distributed to students at the beginning of the spring semester resulted in some needless debate of a non-existent issue. Whatever anyone may have thought was the purpose of these little pieces of paper, the intention was to let the student know how much work he should be doing in his foreign language study throughout the semester. In the first semester we had tried to make clear that a student would probably not gain the required proficiency in his language in a year without 9 hours of contact with the language outside class: 9 hours of reading in the language, listening to tapes, seeing films in the language, having conversations in the language, or studying the grammars of the language. Our repeated announcement of our expectations resulted--judging from the questionnaires all our students filled out last semester--in students spending 0-8 hours a week outside class, the modal number being 1 hour, the median 2, the mean 1.8. The little sheets that most students are not filling out this semester represent our new attempt to remind you that the magic number is 9, not 1, 2, or 1.8, and to help you keep track of your own progress. Letting the student police his own progress is still and always has been the policy of the Linguistics Department, and we conceive of our job as one of informing the student about how much is expected of him; fulfilling that expectation--deciding how much he wants to learn--will always be a decision that remains in the hands of the student, no matter what kind of a program one might devise.

Coming now to the second issue that Mr. Stone raises, the justification for the linguistics component in the freshman language program, we offer the following short argument. No matter what a student's final academic goal is, no matter what he hopes to get out of college, part of his education, and part of the task of those educating him, is to make sure that he has a sound basis on which to rest intelligent opinions of the human world he lives in--and that world includes language, some would even argue that his world is formed by his language.

The unusual claim of linguistics for a share of the student's limited curricular time at UCSD is based on the proposition that knowledge about language is as important to a student as knowledge of a language. The claim has the general support of the academic tradition that includes grammar--knowledge about language--in language courses. The difference at UCSD is that the scope of this knowledge about language is increased to take in language in general, rather than being limited to the grammar of the particular language the student has chosen to learn.

At one time an educated person was expected to know not one, but several modern foreign languages (this is still the case in Europe), as well as the major classical languages--Latin, Greek, Hebrew, among others. Competing demands on the student's time make this virtually impossible today. But some part of the consequent loss in breadth of knowledge of languages can be compensated for by the study of language in general: linguistics. The nature of the language learning process being what it is, it cannot reasonably be required that linguistics must also be justified by its immediate contribution to the student's progress towards his proficiency in speaking a particular foreign language.

It might be pointed out in passing that the demand made by linguistics in the freshman language program is really quite small: 3 hours per week. This semester students are invited to prepare themselves for a final examination on two readings in any way they wish, and instead of the single large, impersonal lecture that was formerly held, members of the linguistics department have offered to meet with students individually or in groups of any size for discussion as often as requested.

David A. Reibel Leonard Newmark