

OREGON EMERALD

Published each Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday of the college year, by the Associated Students of the University of Oregon.
Entered at the postoffice at Eugene as second class matter.
Subscription rates, per year, \$1.00. Single copies, 5c.

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF.....MAX H. SOMMER
Assistant Editors.....Wallace Eakin, Leslie O. Teese
Managing Editor.....Harold Hamstrom
City Editor.....Mandell Welsh
Copy Editors.....Ed Harwood, De Witt Gilbert, Clytie Hall

Special Writers.....Grace Edgington, Frances Shoemaker, Charles Dundore, Walter Kennon.

Administration.....Roberta Killam
Assistant.....Harold Say
Sports.....Chester A. Fee
Assistants.....James Sheehy, Lee Bostwick
Features.....Adrienne Epping, Echo Zak
Dramatics.....Beatrice Locke, Lucile Watson, Catherine Twomey
Society.....Louise Allen
Exchanges.....Martha Tinker
Assistant.....Kenneth Moore, Jean Bell, Robert McNary, Percy Boatman, Cora-
Reporters.....He Snell, Lucile Messner, Joe Skelton, Helen Brenton.

BUSINESS STAFF
BUSINESS MANAGER.....FLOYD C. WESTERFIELD
Assistant Manager.....Kenneth Moore
Advertising Manager.....Burle D. Bramhall
Circulation.....Willy Knighton
Collections.....Estley Farley
Manager's and Editor's Phone—541.

The Political Boomerang.

NEVER IN the history of Oregon politics have we seen such a rotten stack-up. Political lies, political poppy-cock, political pigging, political calumny, political scandal—and so on and on ad infinitum.

There is one word, and that not in the King's holiday English which describes the situation with a smack of precision, and that is plain, old, Anglo-saxon, "rotten"! When groups congregate around library steps, whisper in classes, and plot privately and publically, printable English no longer suffices.

The campus teems with libellous stuff: So-and-so is double-crossing This-and-That, and this fraternity is in a frame-up with that fraternity to squelch yonder fraternity. Such-an-such a sorority pulled So-and-So out of the political pot to give What's-her-Name a chance at the bacon. And this Non-fraternity bunch pulled a raw one by trying to get Such-and-Such a crew to withdraw So-and-So in order to give What's-his-Name a corner on the Pork barrel, at the same time assuring Such-and-Such that their other candidate would draw as strong as the proverbial Limberger. It's rotten, but the worst part of it is that it's not true in the majority of cases. The worst one pulled yet was that which accredited one of the professors with openly recommending that Some-one-Else was a better man than So-and-So, and that the Chump that nominated So-and-So did it only for notoriety and agreed with the aforesaid professor. On the face of it, this talk is poppy-cock; but it is circulating as gospel truth and those who started it did so for political purposes.

This stuff is being talked all over the campus for the purpose of drawing votes. It does not originate with the candidates as a rule, but with those who are behind the candidates. With this sort of pre-election campaigning, the Student Body is not assured of selecting its officers on merit. But the chances are fifty-fifty that the candidate whose backers resort to such waddle will loose out in the finals for the very reason that such devices are retrogressive in the end and come back with the force of a boomerang hurled by the official Australian ballot.

Think It Over.

THE SO-CALLED sophomore amendment, defeated at the last election, by the skin of its teeth, is again before the electorate of the Student Body politic. We do not intend to circulate any pre-digested "Food for Thought," seasoned up with sensational spices, and dished out at the last moment. We do not believe in such slap-dash methods of serving intellectual food. On the other hand what we do believe in is frank and free discussion before election.

We submit the following reasons of why the amendment should not pass, and if you agree with us vote it down. If, on the other hand, you think that our reasoning is shallow, vote for the amendment. What we crave is an intellectual vote on the matter without making an emotional appeal.

Our grounds for rejecting the amendment are as follows:

1. It involves changing the broad principle of University representation to a narrow partisan class representation.
2. All University students have a voice in the council not only by representation, but in virtue of the right of any student or students to present projects in person or writing.
3. The addition of another member to the council will destroy its efficiency, as it is now too large for quality representation.
4. Another member would increase the tendency to shirk council responsibility, such as attendance at meetings, etc.
5. The upperclassmen are truly representatives of all classes, not merely of the classes from which they come.
6. The Council should be made up of persons experienced in the government of the student body.
7. The issue was not presented by underclassmen.
8. Sophomore representation would be of little value to the underclassmen, even though the member had a vote.
9. It will delay the establishment of self-government in the student body.

The mooted amendment was at first put forward with the general contention that the Council should be increased in membership. The Emerald opposed this principle, saying that efficiency demanded a smaller body instead of a larger one. After the last election one of the leading advocates for the amendment came forward saying that the membership of the council should be reduced, but that the ex-officio members should be eliminated. Again we object for the removal of ex-officio members would render the Council out of touch with campus affairs. The Council, in such a status, would become a sort of pink-tea debating society without a vestige of power. Such a move would defeat the aims of the founders of the Student Council, who did so with the avowed purpose of making self-government possible within a few years. In order to safe-guard the council from the evils of being merely a conclave of clashing classes, which would interfere with the welfare of student government and introduce

class higgling and haggling, the founders provided for free, broad representation removed from class-consciousness and petty affiliations. This they did by providing for University representation—mind you, not class representation—and further provided that such representation should be accorded to upperclassmen in lieu of longer experience. Representatives were designated as upperclassmen on the same principle that a senator or representative must be of a certain age to guarantee a certain amount of experience.

Some think that this matter is trivial. We disagree with them because the question is not so much one of sophomore representation as that of changing the entire basis of representation from one of broad University loyalty to one of narrow class partisanship. Instead of endangering the chances of future self-government; instead of introducing class politics into the Council, and instead of lowering the efficiency of the Council—and the passage of the amendment would mean all of this and more—we earnestly advocate voting against the amendment.

Above all think the question over, and vote according to the dictates of judgment. Don't be misled by a gob of red ink smeared all over white paper, which is posted to arouse an emotional response instead of an enlightened, rational response. If the electorate votes on this amendment from the view of what is best for the University and not from the standpoint of class consideration the count will undoubtedly show an overwhelming defeat of the measure.

COMMUNICATIONS

SOPHOMORE REPRESENTATION.

There has been more loose thinking on the question of sophomore representation in the student Council than on any other question that has been before the student body this year. Let us clarify our sky, and having found the real issue, discuss it.

The question of representation, a matter of fundamental right, is the only one that has been raised by the supporters of the measure. If the sophomores are represented in the council, then our friends of opposite minds have lost their only reason for supporting the proposition. In our election the sophomores will vote for the members of the council just the same as the juniors and seniors. Can we say then that the members so elected do not represent the underclassmen whose votes helped to elect them? In general, our student body officers are elected by the entire student body and are the representatives of that body, and not of any class or organization to which they may belong. The council works in the interest of and is representative of the associated students, which includes all classes: freshmen, sophomore, junior and senior; underclassmen and upperclassmen alike.

Since we have seen that the sophomores are represented in the student council, we are free to discuss the real issue that this proposed amendment raises, shall we lower the qualifications for membership on the council? We have seen that this is not a question of fundamental right, but a practical problem. Before changing our present organization we should know whether or not the new one will be any better. Is there anything wrong with the council which the presence of a sophomore could fix? Is there anything inherent in a sophomore that would raise the sagacity, efficiency, and prestige of the council? The council is a forum where ideas are crystallized, and where projects of legislation are formulated to be acted upon by the student body. It is a significant fact that not one of the recommendations of the council have failed to pass. If the council does not reflect the will of the student body, how could it hold such a record. Would anyone be foolish enough to contend that the addition of a sophomore to the organization in question would better enable it to reflect the will of the student body? With these facts before us what reason have we for placing an underclassman on the Council?

The sophomores are now represented on the student council, and hence cannot claim it as a matter of fundamental right, that one of their number be allowed to sit in the council. We have not been able to find where the presence of an underclassman could aid the council in its legislative duties. These two things being true, the proposition before you is of no value, without merit, and most certainly should be rejected.
CLOYD O. DAWSON.

To the Editor:

The student body is being asked a second time, tomorrow, to vote whether or not there shall be a sophomore on the student council next year and hereafter at Oregon.

The vote last time was 206 in favor of the proposed amendment and 108 against. Although the great majority of the student vote was in favor of granting the representation, it lost because the constitution stipulates that amendments shall carry by a two-thirds vote. The student body was in favor of it by nearly two to one; the student council was against it 10 to 3, and yet one of the most strongly harped upon arguments of those opposing the measure is that the student council represents the whole student body as it is.

This is a matter where right coincides with expediency and efficiency. Where

is the logic to a system of student government whereby two-thirds of the student body have no voice in a student body organ which is supposed to represent the sentiment of the whole student body? There are 560 underclassmen in the University of Oregon student body; there are 250 upperclassmen. The 250 upperclassmen are represented on the council—supposedly an organization representing all of the students, by thirteen members; the 560 are represented by none.

There has not been a single real argument advanced against sophomore representation. This bunk about tradition and qualifications for honorary societies applies well to green caps and senior benches, but not to personal rights in a democratic, public institution. True, democracy does demand efficiency, but there is no better way to introduce efficiency than by the fusion of ideas that would result from an underclass representative. The council is not too large in numbers, merely too largely composed of "mature figureheads."

When we get out petitions to the faculty for reinstatement of basketball, we say "We want basketball—that's reason enough for you to reinstate it." The underclassmen want representation, it is fair and just and coincides with good student government, why not give it to them? Why not give them a chance?

The addition of the sophomore member would give underclassmen representation and would still not take away the right to lead in university affairs and policies from the upperclassmen. It would create a greater interest in student body affairs throughout the under classes.

Only fools refuse to change their minds. Let us consider this proposition upon its merits, not crown our lofty and dignified positions as seniors and juniors. If you think a sophomore representative on the student council would in any way clog the wheels of that organ of student opinion, of if you think it the right thing to do, vote down the amendment. But, if the proposition seems to be based upon sound principles, and stands a chance, at least, of improving the student body, whose best interests we all have at heart, let's vote for sophomore representation.

HARRY L. KUCK.

CONGRESS IN OCTOBER

Commonwealth Gathering Planned on Larger Scale Next Fall Says Prof. F. G. Young.

The Commonwealth congress will be held in October according to Professor F. G. Young, of the department of Economics and Sociology. It was at first planned to hold it sometime in May, as in previous years, but because the congress this year is to be larger than formerly and conducted under somewhat different conditions it was thought advisable to hold it later so more preparations could be made.

Professor Young plans to take the matter up with prominent men of the state, people who have no axes to grind, and determine just what topics are to be taken up and who the speakers will be. The program is also to be discussed with some of the state commissions and some of the speakers will probably be members of the next state legislature.

The idea of the Commonwealth congress is to work in the interests of the people of the state at large in getting bills that will be a benefit to the people before the state legislature.

Strikingly Original

Are the new Separate Skirts

New Wash Skirts

The full flare lines make them so deservedly popular and different. In wash skirts we show gabardine, honey comb cloth, repp, piqua, linen, etc. In worsted skirts we show checks, gabardines, serges, etc. A variety of yoke-pocket—and girdle effects. Beautiful materials—faultlessly tailored and all sizes.



Wash skirts \$1.50 to \$4.50
Worsted skirts \$5 to \$12.50
Taffeta skirts \$8.50 to \$12.50

LARGE'S CLOAK & SUIT HOUSE

865 Willamette Street Phone 525
"The Store That Sells Wooltex"

COLLEGE
ICE
CREAM
PHONE 343

The Oregana

The Student Shop
For Oregon Students
Try our candies Our ice cream is Perfect

Use Lane County Butter

Fresh and Sanitary
Always ask your grocer for the Lane County
Creamery Brands
48 Park St.

Fisher Laundry

PHONE 65

The Varsity Barber Shop Antiseptic

Don't be afraid to get your work done here. You can't get any infectious disease, as we keep all our tools in a sterilizer when not in use.

Students we solicit your patronage

JOHN MCGUIRE

Proprietor

For the past six years at Marx Barber Shop, Hull Building 11th and Alder

QUICK DELIVERY GROCERY

E. LEITER, Proprietor
Phone 141

STAPLE LINE OF GROCERIES