

OREGON EMERALD

ALL-AMERICAN 1946-47

The Oregon Daily Emerald, official publication of the University of Oregon, published daily during the college year except Sundays, Mondays, and final examination period. Entered as second-class matter at the postoffice, Eugene, Ore. Member of the Associated Collegiate Press

BOB FRAZIER, Editor	BOB CHAPMAN, Business Manager
Managing Editor	JUNE GOETZE, BOBOLEE BROPHY Co-News Editors
DON FAIR Co-Sports Editor	FRED TAYLOR
WALT McKINNEY, JEANNE SIMMONDS, MARYANN THIELEN Associates to Editor	
PHYLLIS KOHLMEYER & HELEN SHERMAN Asst. Managing Editor	WINNY CARL Advertising Manager
DIANA DYE Assistant News Editors	JIM WALLACE
National Advertising Manager.....Marilyn Turner	Circulation Manager.....Billi Jean Riethmiller

Jane Russell Has Her Points Columnist Finally Agrees

By MIKE CALLAHAN

One of these days we are going to sit down to a large plate of our own words, and eat them comma by comma. The words concern one Jane Russell, actress, and lately singer by profession.

Miss Russell is the number one attraction both in the records and on the cover, of an album just released by Columbia. Titled "Let's Put Out the Light," this offering lives up to its name better than anything except a short-circuit. Besides the title song it includes "Body and Soul," "I Must Have That Man," "Do It Again," "Love For Sale," "Two Sleepy People," "A Hundred Years From Today," and "Until the Real Thing Comes Along."

The "them" girl sings in a low, breathless voice that is well-perfumed with s-x. As the cover blurb puts it, she sings "incredibly close to your shoulder." She may be s-xational but she's also good, very good. Which brings us to the matter of the words.

Some months back this column plugged a collection by Diana Lynn, young M-G-M star, and a pianist with a couple of original trills to her stylings. At the same time we heaved a passing brick at Russell, whose jive waxings with Victor's Kay Kyser were as jumpy as a lead balloon. Shortly thereafter Lynn quit recording and Russell switched from hot to hotter by signing with Columbia. We found our predictions batting a perfect zero.

Jane Russell has two strikes against her in the vocal biz, her own billboard publicity and Peggy Lee. Lee is currently leading the "low and intimate" league for Capitol. But if Russell can top her "Outlaw" reputation and a tendency to lose control of her voice on low or sustained notes she will be in. In the top ranks, that is.

Platter lines: If every crooner must have his year, we pick '48 as the Mel Torme year. Torme (e as in a) has drawn a steady rave from the Broadway press and has jaunted the whole million-dollar circuit. And we mean million-dollar; with nitespot dates, a Hollywood contract, and his own radio show, Torme has hit the big money brackets.

Now Musicraft (whose small string includes such glittering names as Diz Gillespie, Teddy Wilson and Carl Sandburg) has jumped on the Torme express with an album of his best. As if the Torme name weren't enough to skyrocket sales, Musicraft has packed its offering with a strong list of all-timers. These include: "The Day You Came Along," "Fine and Dandy," "Three Little Words," "I Can't Give You Anything But Love, Baby," "I'll Always Be in Love With You," and "Love, You Funny Thing."

Torme's singing style is best described in the words of his former G.I. audience as "the velvet fog." High and thin in the upper registers, Torme's voice broadens into some of the smoothest lower tones we've ever heard. This style first "Tormay-ized" the dogfaces, and from these hit the big time with Artie Shaw in "What Is This Thing Called Love." With this new popular collection released, the Torme future looks like "ceiling unlimited."

Great hits department: With the discompanies already rationing out their stockpiles of new releases, look for some topnotch reissues to become available. With this column we take a second look at the outstanding oldtimers now being rewaxed.

"Sugar Blues" by Clyde McCoy and "Wabash Blues" (paired with "Stumbling") by Russ Morgan are two of the finest trumpet classics ever cut. First pressed in the great days of Bunny Berrigan's sky-climbing horn, these two set a unique trumpet style. McCoy's control of his instrument was so precise that his famed "wah-wah" (later adopted by singer Bonnie Baker) tones seemed almost human. Russ Morgan followed McCoy's lead but varied it with his own high-weaving solos. Don't miss them; their arrangements are now a lost art.

Liberal Groups Urged to Purge Communists from Their Ranks

By HOWARD LEMONS

The tendency to label persons with whom we disagree as communists or fascists is getting the American people into a bad habit. It creates fear and distrust results in disunity, and weakens our domestic and foreign policy. It is time we made our choice between emotional patriotism and imperturbable courage. The weak always believe the pseudo-Christ who prevail from right or left, but we must have a few who will reason and dissuade in the midst of the stampede. The lengths to which we seem prone to go in fighting communism will gain us little if we lose our liberty in the process.

Communists always grovel in the shadows of liberalism. The liberal parties have been guilty of irresolution in dealing with them, but we should not allow this to indict the whole liberal movement. The hope of the liberals must be premised upon the vigil they keep to repel the Communists. Associate with communism and you destroy liberalism; destroy liberalism and you pave the way for a police state.

If the democratic processes in our nation are just, if the government is efficient, if the schools are free, if students learn to think in terms of the historical development of civilization, we shall grow to appreciate man's evolutionary struggle for self determination. If we educate our youth in terms of the literature, the art, the music, the philosophy, and the history of man, and if we balance this with technical training, we shall develop discerning men and good voters.

A person with a full stomach and a free will is rarely searching for communism, a creed which is more likely to appeal to the

ill-clad, the ill-housed and the hungry. To fear communism is to admit the class war. We need not fear Communism if we attack the defeat in our system of government with a view to correcting them.

In 1948 many people will vote for liberal candidates. For the sake of the sincere, and the preservation of our elective system, we must not overlook the danger of labeling all liberals as leftists. We must inquire as to the motives of those who attempt to besmirch the intent of the liberal party. Why do they try to kill the liberal party?

Purge the communists from liberal ranks. Define the issues. Determine who is conservative, who liberal and who communistic. Then we can know of whom we speak; then we can identify our neighbor's belief. Because we would know, we would not fear. We could have confidence in a government where liberals, conservatives, and communists vie for ELECTIVE office. If we cannot believe the voters will select the good, we cannot uphold constitutional government. The communists do not like the liberal party, which is as indigestible to them as "gold exchange." Communists go all the way, and this they cannot do as liberals.

As we come nearer the showdown, the liberals will move to the middle of the road, the conservatives will move more to the side of the vested interests and the militarists, and the communists will continue to spread their mental excretions. But honest, educated, detecting voters will spurn the overtures of the right and left alike. Such is the historical evolution of political movements. Dialectic? Maybe.

Utah Daily Writer Sees Liberalism As Division of Wealth, Responsibility

(Reprinted from an article by David S. Kahn the Utah Daily Chronicle)

For all practical purposes, a man is a liberal if he is called one. However, if we are to know liberals by other methods than the "expedient" ways of politics, it is necessary to be impractical. We must try to measure the man by some objective standard.

There is nothing very wrong with saying that a man is liberal to the extent that he believes it is possible to enhance the dignity of his fellowman. It is just that there remains a big problem of deciding how much that "extent" is. One might say that a hundred per cent liberal was a fellow who believed that there should be an absolutely equal division of everything; be it social prestige, political responsibility, or physical wealth.

SINCE HUNDRED-PERCENTERS are a bit cracked, I see nothing wrong in assuming that liberals have a lunatic fringe. But if a man is less than hundred per cent liberal, as most men are, what foreign doctrine shall we have compromising his good intentions? I believe we can best assume that the faith at the opposite pole of liberalism is authoritarianism. For the liberal emphasizes the common factors in man, and the authoritarian emphasizes the differences.

A hundred per cent authoritarian would have one man supreme, a philosopher prince, before whom all subordinate men would have to cringe and crawl like dogs in the meadow. But most liberals must qualify their attempt to elevate the status of humans by the practical realization that there are differences among men. We may say, then, that a man's faith in humanity can be measured by finding out simultaneously the degrees to which he feels it is desirable or inevitable that authority be buttressed.

IN A DEMOCRATIC society, it is politic for a man to claim he is "liberal" because he holds to the flattering tenet that it is possible to increase the dignity of the voter. And so one comes to think of liberalism as the idealistic position. This need not be for two reasons. First of all, the Platonic vision of a "philosopher king" certainly has a utopian concept of the attainments to which common clay can aspire. Secondly, a liberal can take the

cynical position that we are all sufficiently irresponsible and unenlightened that absolute power will only corrupt a man absolutely. And so he may argue that no matter what the weaknesses of a liberal society, nothing can be worse than the total and absolute corruption of absolute rulers.

Thus, a liberal might find the common elements of man by glancing into the gutter. Aside from the problem of idealism, there are two main points at which there is confusion, in identifying the "liberal." One is the narrow belief that only one particular proposal can be consistent with liberal beliefs. It is clear, however, that men can advocate diametrically opposed policies and remain liberals if their prime motivation is a desire to enhance human dignity while correspondingly reducing the power of an elite. Thus, sincere liberals were opposed to the New Deal because it seemed to involve an undue concentration of power.

The other point of confusion is the belief that militancy in the sense of accepting discipline and authority to accelerate reforms is "more liberal." It is certainly more radical in that in this way the old order may fall more quickly. But clearly, it is not more liberal. Although he is not, the communist should be embarrassed by the similarity in the political relationship of the citizen to the state in prewar Germany and in Russia.

IF WE ARE GOING to determine the extent to which a man is liberal, beyond making a shrewd guess, we must have a yardstick. To do so, one must arbitrarily assume some criteria and norms. For example, one may assume that there are three main spheres of activity in which it is possible to enhance the dignity of man; social, political and economic.

Thus, a typical liberal viewpoint would favor racial equality, the secret ballot, and unions, respectively. All these sample institutions diversify power more greatly and in so doing enhance the dignity of the individual. An elaborate test of this nature could be drawn up and scored for liberalism from zero to one hundred. Our norm could have it that those scoring under thirty could be classified as authoritarian. I think this scoring system shows my bias. Such a test may show me up, but I think I'm a liberal.