

# Will Rice Reconsiders Policing Obligations

The injustice of college government officials being required to enforce regulations not approved by the students was one of the central topics of debate at Will Rice's college meeting Monday night.

The college meeting was intended to stimulate thought on a problem of the college, Will Rice President Tom Schunior said in a statement read to the college Tuesday night. After a very brief discussion of the college's role in regulating behavior a number of radical proposals were made.

"I want now to emphasize that neither the president nor the Diet intend to depart from clear college tradition without the

most careful thought being given to such a move." Schunior explained, "The official policy of Will Rice College is in no way changed.

## Dangerous Thinking

"Nonetheless, I and other college members have been accused of Thinking Dangerous Thoughts. I maintain that any attempts to limit open and frank discussion of our problems will be detrimental to the interest of the college. I would therefore urge college members to turn their attention from matters of university politics and consider the function of the college and the part which rules play in achieving that function."

Schunior opened Monday's meeting by passing out four mimeographed pages on the history of discipline in Will Rice. He proposed that the principal topic of discussion should be: "Why do we want rules, and if we want rules, what are they intended to do?"

## Rules Classified

There exist two distinct types of rules, Schunior suggested. Our rules, the rules formulated by the college government to facilitate living together; and Their Rules, rules established by the school administration to avoid community sanctions.

Officers of the student government are put in a position impossible for a democratically

elected leader, Schunior said. They are elected as representatives of the students but are made responsible for the enforcement of university regulations which the students have historically failed to support.

The discussion was opened by John Behrman who suggested that the Will Rice open house proposal be used as a means of testing the college's ability to formulate its own rules.

"The college should take the proposal, start it, say next week—just start it," Behrman said. "If the administration wants to get bothered about it, then let them.

Behrman argued that the colleges are effectively the seats of university discipline, and that they have achieved better levels of discipline than were possible before their founding. The administration would have no feasible method of running the college without its student government.

## Consider Referendum

Another proposal by which the college might be able to assert its freedom from the obligation of enforcing university regulations was suggested by Will Rice senior Bud Brown. The college could hold a referendum to determine what rules it would consider its own and refuse to enforce all others.

(Continued on Page 8)

# WRC--

(Continued from Page 1)

Other supporters of these proposals stated that to adopt them would further the fight for individual freedom and end the student's reacting in fear to the administration.

Speakers opposing these sug-

gested actions did not seriously question the claim that the "ours-theirs" dichotomy of regulations exists. Their main argument was that it is preferable for the college government to continue to negotiate with the administration with its present structure rather than to threaten its structure by a revolution-

ary rejection of its delegated responsibilities.

Students favoring the proposals contended that the authority of the college government is derived from the consent of the governed. The university originally delegated its authority, but now the situation is more nearly a contract arrangement.

Will Rice Junior Jimmy Edmondson, stating his opposition to the proposals, contended that the college was not a glorified proctoring system as had been declared, but an institution which had made significant advances in developing a library and speaker programs and which held the potential of further achievements. He held that the inconveniences of the dichotomy of rules did not justify threatening this potential.

Next week a statement will be drawn up making specific proposals according to President Schunior.