

# Mom, Can You Let Me Have-----Or an Unusual Touch

IT'S the multi-annual "touch" again Mother. But this time it's not for ourselves. We truthfully think it is for a worthy purpose, and believe you'll agree with us when you understand how things are.

This University (and its sister schools of the state system of higher education) needs money and needs it very badly indeed. The entire state system of higher education has so little money that it can't even patch the knees it has worn out in the past five years from begging money on which to exist. And that's pretty bad.

CONDITIONS for the system's schools are told in detail in a report to the Oregon legislature's interim commission recently made by the board of higher education.

Among other things:

1. It points out that enrollment in Oregon's higher learning is now at the highest point ever reached in its history.
2. State appropriations for higher education have decreased 15 per cent since 1929-1930.
3. Appropriations for other state divisions have increased 25 per cent since that biennium.
4. Salaries were restored in other state divisions

March 1, 1937, but because of shortage in funds, salaries in higher education could not be restored until July 1, 1937.

5. It bears the recommendation of the board that sufficient funds be made available during 1930-1940 to enable the institutions of higher learning to continue their present extra and scarcely-recognized services to the people. The report goes on to state what a few of those "extra" services are, including Doernbecher hospital and out-patient clinic, medical school operation, extension and research work, and maintenance of experiment stations.

A catch in the setup as it exists now is that a large part of the regular millage that supports the University and State College has been diverted into the maintenance of the normal schools, extension and research work, and other "extra services." These were formerly taken care of by special appropriations by the legislature every two years, but were ceased after the biennium of 1929-1930, when the depression hit.

MOST of the rest of the story about Oregon's higher education system and the hole it is in has been told many times. How the proportion of students to faculty staff has gradually increased until the class rooms are so over-crowded as to

prevent the gaining of higher education. The norm in expenditures of 1930 is far above the appropriations for higher education at the present, while other state agencies are far above that norm. Facts about the working of the system (at great savings) under the unified state system are reviewed by the board's report. Truths about Oregon's fees being higher (both for resident and non-resident students) than those of any other state's schools are revealed in the report which the interim commission will study before the next legislature.

WHERE does Mother come in? Why has she been enlisted in this fight by her own sons and daughters attending these schools? It isn't hard to figure out the answer. In her short visit here she has seen many of the advantages of education, perhaps also some of the disadvantages under which the system is working at present.

Others, not so fortunate, are not aware of these facts. If they were perhaps something could be done. So Mother, if you will only tell them what we are doing, what we need, and what might be done with more money for education, perhaps you can inform the people of the state.

So Mother, we are making a little touch. Not for next weekend's date, not for that new sweater, but for all of us.

## Guest Column

Editor's note: This being men's edition, it was felt by the staff that a contribution from a member of the journalism school faculty would be a fitting addition to the paper. Accordingly, Charles M. Hulten, assistant professor of journalism, was asked to write on a topic of his own choosing. His article follows:

By CHARLES M. HULTEN

Without trying to chisel in on any of the glory, I want to congratulate Editor Mat and his staff for their "all-American Pacemaker" accomplishment with the Emerald this year. To be among the six best of 450 is no mean job.

From day to day, as he passes among his academic brothers, any journalism teacher hears a lot of "grousing" about this or that story, or editorial, in the college paper. Protest as he may that the journalism school acts only in the most indirect advisory capacity, the implied criticism is there: "Well, anyway, it's your training, or lack of it, that is responsible."

Journalism students know that their teachers are just as critical as anyone, if somewhat more objective. Irk as they may, the criticisms are a healthy sign and, as often as not, have as their basis situations which provide journalistic lessons.

But every so often, when a particularly bad "bull" has happened, individuals do more than criticize. They suggest that what is needed is a more "iron-clad control." Try to avoid the word as they may, coat the pill as ingeniously as they can, what they propose is censorship.

With such proposals I, personally, disagree.

By "censorship" I mean pre-publication restraint. I would not suggest that there should be any lessening of responsibility for what has been printed. All of the responsibilities to truth, decency, courtesy, and welfare of the community must remain, and the editor must be made aware and answerable for any transgressions upon them.

It is the artificial ownership that makes a college paper peculiarly open to arguments for authoritarian control. An editor has his customers, his advertisers, and, in the end, his job or his bankroll at stake. Except in rare cases, the college editor has none of these hazards. A thoughtless, ill-timed, or immature policy can harm the institution in which he is so conspicuous a figure, sometimes very seriously. And the controls to which he is subjected are, in most cases, very loose ones.

Despite all this, and fully aware as I am of the dangers of uncontrolled college journalism I still am unalterably opposed to a censorship. My reasons, in brief:

1. The editorship must attract the most able student. Ability grows under responsibility, declines under authority. Let the editor become a "stooge" and I should look for a different type of student executive.
  2. Under control from above, a little game develops: students frequently try to put over as much as they can on the censor. Even the most vigilant censor may not realize the dynamite in a carefully worded news item.
  3. In a democracy, to train students to be constantly aware of authoritarian restraint is to do a disservice to journalism, however realistic such training may be for certain types of newspapers. To encourage future newspaper men to be constantly aware of what they think the boss may want written, rather than to be aware of truth and accuracy, is an end that I want no part of.
  4. Finally, I am not convinced that faculty, or administration control might not be as squeamish, as thin-skinned, or as reactionary as student control might be daring, heedless, or irresponsible. This world is moving; journalism is advancing with it. I would be just as willing to entrust the canons of decency and taste to some of the responsible student editors I have known as to entrust them to some of the hide-bound faculty censors, or would-be censors, I have met.
- Such is the very nature of censorship.

## Oregon Daily Emerald

The Oregon Daily Emerald, official student publication of the University of Oregon, published daily during the college year except Sundays, Mondays, holidays and final examination periods. Entered as second-class mail matter at the postoffice, Eugene, Oregon.

BILL PENGRA, Editor

BUD JERMAIN, Managing Editor.

Doug Parker, Movie, Radio, and Church Editor.

Glenn Hasselroth, Personality and Literary Editor

Waldemar Updike, Conference Editor.

Lyle Nelson, Short Wave Editor.

Rod Orange, Unemployment Editor.

Phil Bladine, Chief Desk Editor.

John Maurice Biggs, Second Assistant Proofreader.

Elbert Hawkins, Sports Editor.

Charles Green, Chief Night Editor.

George Pasero, "Queen" Editor.

## Is Little Brother Coming to the University?

WHY not plan to send little brother down here to the University next Mom, if it can be worked out financially. If you think it would be in some way profitable to him to come down here or over to our northern branch at Corvallis that would be a very good idea.

Now that you've been here a couple of days and seen our splendid pageant, you should have a pretty good notion formed of our school. Now that we've shown you by means of elaborate preparations—just what college is not like, you've probably formed an opinion.

There's no doubt but that your opinion will be favorable toward us. We've been on our best behavior in our best Sunday suit. Our faculty and administration have worked with the energetic crew committee chairmen and "activity men" (all of them are the ex-bosses of political campaigns a year ago) to make this one weekend a brilliant success. The educational activities board and the junior class have combined their efforts to paint a rosy picture of Oregon, the beautiful, glamorous institution you should send little brother or sister to in order to further his or her education.

The stage was set, the play produced as well as possible, everything was laid before your eyes in good shape—now it's your move Mother. Will you send your next youngest to Oregon?

BUT before you swallow the bait, that is providing that finances will stand for it, why not think over whether it is best that the younger one come here?

First, was the show put on to attract any

## I'm Glad You Came Down, Mother

THIS should be a big weekend for both of us Mom. Plans are all made for you and the rest of the visitors to have an enjoyable time viewing the many colorful attractions of this biggest school year event. But more than that, more attention will be paid to you this weekend than any other because it is Mothers' day weekend. You'll receive some of the at-

and all kinds of youngsters? Should any and all be allowed to come here? Not if we are to believe the short quips many of our professors are constantly hammering into our ears.

The University should not be a place for anyone who has social or fraternal ambitions only, they tell us. Persons without certain definite purposes, such as obtaining a higher education or professional school training, should be banned. Money and time wasters are other menaces to the standards of our institution, we are told.

Our enrollment, some of the more mathematically-minded faculty members tell us, is getting up almost double what it was at the bottom of the depression. And yet no provision is being made to raise correspondingly the appropriations that run the schools. Perhaps by the time little brother gets down here to begin his studies (and if he comes down here at all that is what he should come to do) the classes will have doubled also. How much learning will he receive from an instructor who has to give personal attention to several courses containing a hundred persons each. Of course there may be a few students in those groups of a hundred; if our pride and joy is of this class then he may profit somewhat if "the system of mass production of college men" doesn't take him into its camp.

WHAT will little brother or sister get out of the time he would spend on this campus. Yes he would learn to help the administration stage this "Hollywood" front you have seen demonstrated. But is it worthwhile and best for him? Think it over. Why send little brother to college?

tention that is so thoughtlessly denied you during the rest of the year.

Yes, when we came home for weekends and vacations during the year our hats go on a hook, our luggage and dirty clothes to the basement, and ourselves out the door after a quick kiss. It would be more decent of us to let our other interests go for a while and

(Please turn to page seven)