

OREGON DAILY EMERALD

The Oregon Daily Emerald, published daily during the college year except Sundays, Mondays, holidays, and final examination periods by the Associated Students, University of Oregon. Subscription rates: \$1.25 per term and \$3.00 per year. Entered as second-class matter at the postoffice, Eugene, Oregon.

Represented for national advertising by NATIONAL ADVERTISING SERVICE, INC., college publishers' representative, 420 Madison Ave., New York—Chicago—Boston—Los Angeles—San Francisco—Portland and Seattle.

Editorial and Business Offices located on ground floor of Journalism building. Phone 3300 Extension: 382 Editor; 353 News Office; 359 Sports Office; and 354 Business Offices.

UPPER BUSINESS STAFF

Anita Backberg, Classified Advertising Manager
 Bill Peterson, Circulation Manager
 Mary Ellen Smith, Promotion Director

Ron Alpaugh, Layout Production Manager
 Eileen Millard, Office Manager

LYLE M. NELSON, Editor
 JAMES W. FROST, Business Manager
 ASSOCIATE EDITORS: Hal Olney, Helen Angell

Himmie Leonard, Managing Editor
 Fred May, Advertising Manager
 Kent Stitzer, News Editor
 Bob Rogers, National Advertising Mgr.

UPPER NEWS STAFF
 Pat Erickson, Women's Editor
 Ray Schrick, Ass't Managing Editor
 Corrine Wignes, Executive Secretary
 Bob Flavelle, Co-Sports Editor
 Betty Jane Biggs, Ass't News Editor
 Mildred Wilson, Exchange Editor
 Ken Christianson, Co-Sports Editor
 Wes Sullivan, Ass't News Editor

More Support for the Band

TOMMY Mayes' letter to the Emerald of a few days ago has caused considerable comment. "Is what he says about the University band really true?" students are asking. Several have requested that the question be brought up and discussed here.

The problem of what to do with the band is not a new one. Tommy has brought up a very old question, but has presented new arguments for a change. He is right in several of his statements and wrong in others. For the benefit of those students who are interested, in the following facts might prove helpful.

First, Tommy is right when he says that the University band—the one that plays at football games—is under the sponsorship of the ROTC department. At the time of organizing the new band it was thought best to combine it with the ROTC band and put both under the one sponsorship. The present football band practices in the ROTC shack, stores its equipment there, and depends upon the department for many of its members.

TOMMY is wrong in implying that everything is left to the ROTC department and that the rest of the University doesn't "give a hoot." An investigation of the budget of the educational activities board would find quite a sum set aside each year for the band. That sum is for uniforms, cleaning, repairing instruments, and other similar items.

The educational activities board has supported the football band—perhaps not enough at times—through its budget. It has never assumed control of the band because it felt that such a step would be unwise.

THE important point contained in all of Tommy's argument is that the University band now should be taken out of the ROTC department and put where it can receive more attention—and the support of the entire University. This is not meant as a criticism of the heads of the ROTC department because with more important things before them they can hardly afford to spend much time with the band.

The band has simply outgrown the niche cut out for it and should be found another. Its importance to the University—for it is the show part of every football game—can hardly be overestimated. No means of gaining support for the band should be overlooked.

Parade of Opinion

By Associated Collegiate Press

"As the College Man Sees the War," by Willard Thorp, Professor of English, Princeton university, condensed from the New York Times Sunday Magazine.

What are the young men in our colleges thinking about the war? Their elders are worried. Cynical professors are suspected of having corrupted their faith in democracy by a too critical exposition of its failures. Proof of the reasonableness of the attitudes of most students emerges from the survey on which this article is based. A group of Princeton upper classmen were asked to answer at length the questions below.

1. What is your view of the 1914-18 war? The problem of the causes and results of the World war is to these men enormously complex, but they concur in the opinion that "Everybody wanted it and nobody won." They believe the peace was outrageous and that the Nazi movement stems from it. Some believe a stalemate might have been better than the victory which we made possible but which we refused to use for establishment of a decent world order.

2. How far shall we go in aid to Britain? Some advocate maximum aid. Some regret we have gone so far. The significant note in all replies is self-defense. All too clearly, thoughtful students have been made aware of the failures and evasions of British statesmanship since the last war.

3. Should we enter the war? If so, when? Only one man

says "Never." A number say "Only if attacked" or "When England is in danger of collapse." Several fear an inevitable trend to totalitarianism here if we go in, and feel this is a more immediate danger than Nazi penetration or invasion. Only one believes we have a moral obligation to fight as soon as we can.

4. Have the Nazi anything? People who fear youth may have been misled will find comfort in the answers to this question. On the credit side of the Nazi ledger, as these men see it, are efficiency, military astuteness, economic ingenuity, complete exploitation of resources, unity of purpose. They suspect that negative morality, lust for power, and denial of freedom to the workers will be Germany's undoing. Most reassuring is their belief that the Nazi virtues are not virtues when one looks beneath the surface.

5. What is positive in American democracy? Let no viewer-with-alarm fool himself—these men value highly the sense of responsibility for government which Americans have, the civil liberties they enjoy, the capacity for peaceful change their institutions evince.

6. What part have school and college played in shaping your present conclusion? Those who replied insist that their present attitude has resulted as much from family influence, conversations with friends, reading, and opinions of commentators as from professorial indoctrination. They are grateful to their university courses for helping them clarify conflicting testimony. "My schooling has above all opened my eyes to the measureless value of democratic institutions."

All these students have looked forward with enthusiasm to a profession after college. To throw aside all their hopes for a good life is not easy. But it is evident, too, that if convinced they must fight to make it possible for those who succeed them to have the kind of life they want, few of them will hesitate.

International Side Show

By RIDGELY CUMMINGS

In a letter notable for its restraint, dignity, sincerity, and freedom from personal innuendos, Charles A. Lindbergh has tendered his resignation as a colonel in the air reserve and the resignation has been accepted by the war department. The noted flier has been in the forefront of those who are trying to keep us out of



Cummings

war and because he has had the courage to express views in direct disagreement with those of Roosevelt he has been made the object of a smear campaign.

The president has implied that Lindy is a "copperhead," the name applied to those northerners who during the civil war believed that the South was going to win. This is an unjust accusation, it seems to me, for so far as I know Lindbergh has never said that Germany would defeat the United States.

England Doomed?

He has publicly declared that he believes England is doomed to fall under Hitler's war machine—but apparently Roosevelt thinks the same thing, else why is he so anxious to have this country enter the war on England's side if it is not to save the British empire?

Lindbergh certainly has a right to publicly express his opinions, regardless of how distasteful they may be to Mr. Roosevelt. The president's remarks certainly do not show such a profound belief in tolerance and in freedom of speech and conscience as he has professed on other occasions.

Quote the Tribune

Quoting from the New York Herald Tribune for April 26, in the story dealing with Roosevelt's attack on Lindbergh there is the following paragraph:

"Any mentality, he (Roosevelt) indicated, which could lump Cromwell and Washington with the other three (Alexander, Caesar, Napoleon), was not much of a mentality. He was awfully sorry, he added, that people of those mentalities were in such high

places that they could write or talk at all. It was just dumb."

If that is how the president is talking at his press conferences it looks bad for freedom of speech and press in the near future. He is "awfully sorry" that people who interpret history differently from him are in such positions "that they could write or talk at all." Page the concentration camps! There is not much writing and talking done in those vile abodes which Roosevelt presumably wants to see eliminated from Europe.

Lack of Confidence?

Even Mrs. Roosevelt, McArthur court speaker, seems to have missed the boat in a recent Los Angeles interview in which the United Press quotes her as saying that Lindbergh "seems to have a strange lack of confidence in our own people." If she was referring to Lindbergh's statement about England's defeat then she implies that "our own people" are guaranteeing England's victory. But we can't do that short of war, and "our own people" have not yet signified their willingness to jump completely into the European maelstrom that will eat up our men and resources and leave us once again holding the bag.

That's the spinach, gentle reader, and now here is the whipped cream dessert—rather frothy.

Character Sketch No. 3

The object of my objections Suffers from ingrown teeth. Her many fickle affections Show a warm heart underneath.

She recently nursed a black eye, Just one of her many woes, But why should she sigh, ai, ai, When Waller goes where she goes?

She has a record collection Which she holds very dear, Although a choice selection Sometimes gets hocked for beer.

This gal has a pale complexion And her hair is recently clipped; She promised to keep a date with me, But fears "they" may think she's slipped.

UNION NOW!

By Ann Reynolds

The one point that has been agreed upon by everyone connected with the student union is that politics and personal opinion must not be used as yardsticks by which the question of sites will be decided. Recently with the sudden spurt of interest in the movement that several groups have shown we've seen definite opinionated support of certain sites.

This is the very element that must not enter the student union movement. In this program, if in no other campus activity, it is hoped that unbiased reason will for once replace controlled prejudiced scrapping for ulterior selfish motives.

Future to Consider

The primary point that should be considered by every person expressing an opinion is that this building will not be built for present campus power houses but for the large majority of students who in the future must use the building. It would be well for the ardent advocates of certain sites to remember that if they are successful in high-pessuring student opinion into their prepared molds, they would also be held responsible for the ultimate success, or failure of the building.

Here's something more to consider about the Deady property. The decision of the University's architects is that if the building were planned for this site we would have to wait three years before the plans were started. The reason for this is that the expense of utility and service branches installation would be too great for the present budget. Although we have the \$250,000 in bonds to be sold, more security must be raised to back them.

This decision, perhaps will put a different slant on the choice of the site. If students are willing to wait three years, we could have the building on this property.

More Funds Needed

Further investigation has revealed that if the building was planned on the Sheldon block additional funds would also have to be raised. The estimated cost of building is \$264,000. Thus approximately \$20,000 would have to be secured. This would necessitate a longer period of time until we could start building.

In other words these two decisions suggest that unless the other sites are seriously considered students will have to wait longer for their building than was first expected.

OREGON DAILY EMERALD

Night Staff:

Ardie Alexander, night editor
 Fred Treadgold
 Betty Anunsen
 Doris Jones

Copy Desk Staff:

Bill Hilton, city editor
 Mary Wolf, assistant
 Bob Frazier
 Kent Stitzer
 John Kahananui
 Don Ross
 Helen Flynn
 Betty Sevier
 Bernie Engel

Infirmarites Miss

Listening to "The Lone Ranger" instead of Eleanor Roosevelt last night were infirmarites Mary Robinson, Evelyn Johnson, Alice Lucas, Frances Baily, James Crump, Bill Campbell, John Ryel, James Kurtz, Tom Oxman, Bill Hoyt, Fred Foster, Allen Van Duyn, James Durkheimer, and Burson Ireland.