Pitzer Opens Door For Discussion
As Administration, Students Meet

By EUGENE KEILIN
Rice University President K. S. Pitzer met last Friday with the president of the four men's colleges to discuss the problem of student responsibility for the enforcement of university regulations. Also present at the meeting were the five college masters, Chancellor Carey Cronin, and Dean S. W. Higginbotham.

President Pitzer opened the meeting by stating that the relationship between students and their government and the administration was a major problem area which he felt needed discussion and solution. Claiming that a major factor in the success of the Honor Council was its operation in a well-defined sphere, he asserted that such a definition is needed in the area of student government.

The President began discussion by saying, "A line needs to be drawn between student government and the administration, and I enter this discussion with no preconceived notion as to where that line should be drawn."

THE STUDENT leaders replied that recent events have made their position so indefinite that only after a period of re-examination and consolidation could a positive student proposal be offered.

There was agreement that the students in general as distinguished from the student governments felt no responsibility toward enforcing university rules.

Student Association President Reed Martin suggested that "student government should exist ideally as the formal and final body for enforcing rules the students set for themselves, while students currently find themselves enforcing rules they do not respect. The students will enforce rules that they themselves establish, but feel no responsibility toward rules imposed upon them."

Dr. Carl Wischmeyer, Master of Baker College, pointed out that the colleges lack formal means for enforcement. For example, a college cannot force a member to pay college fees, but must borrow the authority, pro tempore, from the administration.

WILL RICE College president Tom Giesen reported that the meeting was conducted in a tone favorable to the colleges. It was his feeling that it was unfortunate that the majority of the meeting dealt in regulatory terms rather than in a discussion of the evolution of the colleges.

President Giesen felt that the colleges should move toward constructive programs so that they will gain sufficient measure of support in order for the college members to feel compelled to regulate themselves.

"Emphasis should be placed," Giesen said, "on constructive programs rather than on capacity to assume a disciplinary role. The majority of energy should be spent in working out constructive programs.

"It was generally agreed that the athletes constitute a peripheral problem, not a central one. (Giesen was apparently referring to the problem of integrating the athletes into the college system discussed in last week's Thresher editorial.) The feeling had been in days previous to make the athletes the scapegoats. This is not justified by the facts."

JIM HAMMOND, Hanszen College president, considered the meeting valuable in that it cleared the air and "cleared up any misconceptions that the administration would impose any new regulations or was anti-college."