

## The Harris-Collins Platform

The ultimate goal of the university should be to help its students become capable of seeing as many aspects of any problem they face as they can. They should also be self-motivating. Scholarly research, the preservation of our academic and cultural heritage, and the creation of citizens capable of controlling their society in a complex age are founded on the principles of broad free inquiry and dedication enough to that inquiry to carry it out in keeping with the highest academic standards. The University needs to reassert these values, too, if it is to lead in forming the lines along which our society develops, rather than being led by our society's present-day pressures.

We believe that this goal can only be approached by reforming the structure of the university. If we wish to instill the ability to make the best choice from the widest set of alternatives, we must hold freedom of choice as a method in our institution. Self-motivation can only come by a process within each individual -- a process best stimulated by placing the entire responsibility for the individual's life upon himself. Fettering him with regulations, degree requirements, housing requirements, or unnecessary social rituals can only hinder this process. Ironically, these restrictions are usually presented as ways to improve students, but their coercive nature and their bureaucratic oversimplification do more harm than good. They appear to be more attempts to socialize the student than educate him.

In proposing ways to reach this goal, sometimes very simple changes would have far-reaching effects. The discussion of such changes helps us to see the nature of our goals and the relation to present issues. An example: An effective way to come closer to our goal of choice and self-motivation would be to make the only requirement for a BA the completion of 180 units of work. This work would be graded only at the students request. All advising on courses of study would be based on the student's choosing his goals and on the persuasive ability of faculty in recommending the relevance of appropriate courses of study. To assume that students would not use the opportunity to learn without being forced is absurd and degrading to university students. Some might not take full advantage of the system, but they would aid the educational process by their absence from it.

This idea would benefit the faculty as well as the students. They would still have the incentives of research and consultation with colleagues, and their students would be interested, since no student would be required to take a course in which he was not interested. The Stanford degree would no longer be a meaningful label of proficiency, true, but what institution could turn down a graduate simply on the grounds that he might not have best used his education. They would simply have to judge him as himself, an old-fashioned but valuable practice.

This idea presents a radical change, one not immediately possible and one with too many implications to discuss completely here, but it illustrates how structural changes can lead toward the ideal conception of the university. One ill very apparent in most suggestions for change is that tactics are valued more than goals. An idea is not invalid because powerful people oppose it, and people who hold advanced and different ideas will not necessarily be too radical in their tactics to achieve their goals. Let us decide whether an idea is right and then decide the best way to realize it.

Restraint, patience, responsibility, compromise--all of these activities are important. But the mind is the battlefield of ideas. The ideas below are some we believe to be right. They will be further discussed during our campaign.

### SPECIFIC PROPOSALS

#### The Organization of the University

- A. The University should move toward a "one scholar, one vote" system of government.
  1. "Scholars" include students, faculty, and administration.
  2. The Board of Trustees should be elected by all scholars. Terms should be for four years, with some elections each year. Current students and faculty should not be eligible to run for the Board. The Board is presently a self-perpetuating body.

- A. 3. The legislative body of the University, where decisions of policy are made, should be elected by and from all constituencies of scholars.
- B. In the very near future, efforts should be made or continued to include students on all levels of decision of the University, and the faculty should be invited to send members to LASSU. The subcommittees of the Academic Council should include students as voting members. Meetings of the Board of Trustees should be open. In addition to the Committee of 15, a larger discussion group comprised of all scholars, should be set up to discuss issues recommended to it by its constituencies.

#### The Educational Process

- A. The requirements for undergraduate degrees should be radically changed.
1. There should be no General Studies requirements. All major and non-major courses should be graded pass-fail or replaced by paragraph summaries of a student's performance.
  2. More credit and opportunities for independent study and off-campus projects (such as social work, tutoring, etc.) should exist.
  3. Freshmen should be urged to take independent study for the third quarter of their freshman year.
  4. The residence requirement should be reduced so that students could do independent study away from the University for part of their work and receive credit for it.
- B. Admissions should be based not only on a totally non-discriminatory policy with respect to race or belief, but should also actively cultivate applications from areas with little opportunities for the usually-accepted modes of preparation for college.
- C. The advising system should be more a discussion of goals and student needs, and less a technical aiding with choosing courses from the academic chinese menu.
- D. More attention should be given to teaching excellence in deciding promotion and tenure of professors.

#### The Status of the Student within the University

- A. All regulations of conduct which solely effect students should be made by students.
1. Such rules as social regulations, possession of liquor, open house hours, or birth control should be recognized as areas of student jurisdiction.
- B. All social regulations should be put on a voluntary basis.
- C. All students should be allowed to live on- or off-campus, as they choose.
- D. Minor inequalities such as modes of address, parking tickets and places, and unequal payment for the Daily should be rectified.
- E. Our medical facilities should include: information and prescription of contraceptive devices to all desiring them, within the limits of state law and medical practice; A pharmacy on campus; Opportunities to take LSD under medical supervision and with all medical advice, within the limits of state law and medical practice.
- F. The liquor policy should be no more restrictive than state law. This policy should be enacted as soon as possible. Student-faculty functions should serve liquor. Beer should be served in the Tresidder Union. The university should investigate the question of legalizing marijuana and the lowering of the drinking age.

#### Student Activities

- (1) Rush should be abolished. All living groups should participate in a draw system.
- (2) Living groups should be able to set their own standards of conduct, within the law, and have original jurisdiction over all judicial cases within the group.
- (3) Activities on-campus should be de-centralized, using living groups and establishing coffee houses, book shops, and theatres around campus.
- (4) Freshman and upper-class housing should be merged.
- (5) The extent of co-ed housing within a living group should be determined by the group.
- (6) Athletics should be valued as a nice pastime, but not as essential to the idea of a university.
- (7) Applications for foreign campuses should be decided in a draw system. GPA is an arbitrary and absurd way to predict success overseas. Students at foreign campuses should have no regulations limiting their travel at any time during their stay. Students should be able to remain in Europe and receive Stanford credit for independent study.

"THE NEW COMMITMENT--WHO ARE THEY KIDDING? An analysis of the Klein-Jacobi Platform  
(by the Harris-Collins Platform Committee)

The Klein-Jacobi platform is a combination of noble, vapid concepts and innocuous, unoriginal specific proposals. We will first examine specifics, then make general comments.

1) "a total re-examination of the academic curriculum and environment...by a student committee." What an original idea! The ASSU Education Commission has already been set up to be just this committee. Anyway, instead of appointing a committee, a platform should state the candidates' ideas on education. Where are they?

2) "...a reconsideration of the aims and accomplishments of the General Studies Program." Again, how original, but at least they are keeping up with the Administration. President Sterling has already announced to his student advisory committee that the administration wants a sweeping restudy of General Studies next year. Also, the Education Commission has a General Studies and Grading Committee, chaired by our campaign manager.

3) "...a voluntary pass-fail system in all courses outside the major field." Again, what an idea! Dean Wert has a similar, though slightly more conservative, proposal before the Committee on Undergraduate Education right now.

4) "...reforms within the Overseas Campus program..." also, support work of the Martindale Committee examining Overseas Campus academic curricula "urge the adoption of its recommendations in full." How nice, what are they? We call this "creative blanket acceptance." What are Klein and Jacobi's ideas?

5) "modify the idea of a "European experience"...focus on the culture of the country in which the individual campus is located." This is vague and unclear. In France group VIII, for example, students took 12 units of French, 4 units of French Civ, 8 units of French sociology, and 8 units of the Modern Novel, with emphasis on the French. How French can you get?

6) "students...as advisory members on the Committee on Undergraduate Education." Once again, how original. This specific issue is now before the Committee of 15. Further, why should students be only advisory members? Why shouldn't they have votes? Whose undergraduate education is it, anyway? We get the feeling that either (1) Klein-Jacobi doesn't trust student opinion enough to give it voting voice in the decision-making structure of the university, or (2) they are only proposing "safe" ideas in glowing terms, proposals which people are working for already.

7) "...students as advisory members on the Board of Trustees..." Again, the souls of originality. This has been advocated and mentioned in LASSU for months. Again, why advisory members? How about a few faculty members, too? Or would students and faculty tend to advocate narrow vested interests, where, in Dean Wert's words, "a function of the Board of Trustees is to ask good questions from a more detached perspective?"

8) "...President or Vice-President should visit each living group at least once a month." At the risk of being called radical, we propose an ASSU delegate to live in each living group and to be chosen by the group. Oh, that sounds like a LASSU rep? Well, gee, we guess it wasn't such an original idea after all.

9) "...open the doors of student government to all who wish to work in formulating student policy." This plank is based on a totally erroneous assumption, that those doors have been closed. They have been wide open, but nobody has deigned to come in. They were so open that Mr. Klein could get a seat on the LASSU Student Affairs Committee a few weeks after he came into LASSU, just by applying. We feel that this attitude, projecting an "in crowd", is a feeble attempt to assuage the semi-consciences of some lazy students who have good intentions but little energy. We feel that by providing rationalizations for apathy, by blaming it on government, Klein and Jacobi are encouraging apathy. But they don't say that; they might alienate somebody.

10) "...a President's Council to co-ordinate student policy." Does this mean the house presidents? This would create a duplicate LASSU, joy of joys. Apparently, these candidates believe that house presidents are good guys and LASSU reps bad guys. Then we'd have AWS and AMS, with no off-campus or graduate representation. On