

# Interim Group Policy Question for Debate

Editor's note: Each day of this week the Emerald will present the pro's and con's of some of the controversial issues in the PNCC resolutions. These articles are intended to clarify some of the proposals before the vote is taken May 18 and 19. Tomorrow Allen and Miller will discuss the resolution on enforcement of UN decisions.

By VINITA HOWARD

Questions of how to make the Little Assembly and the United Nations a more workable organization will come before the University of Oregon students Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday of next week, but for the two Oregon delegates to the Pacific Northwest College congress the questions have already been discussed and argued.

One argument between the two Oregon delegates, Warren Miller, senior in political science, and Bob Allen, junior in political science, arose over the resolution passed at the congress concerning the Little Assembly of the United Nations.

This resolution as it will appear on the ballot next week is as follows:

That this third Pacific Northwest College congress is opposed to the tendency of the Interim committee to apply the pressure of its opinions toward restriction or abolition of the veto power and the unanimity rule in the United Nations, and toward weakening the authority of the Security council, and

That this congress supports the continuation of the Interim Committee only if it is actually constituted as a subsidiary body performing a constructive function, as provided in the charter of the United Nations, and only if it enjoys the voluntary acceptance and participation of all the great powers.

Miller, Allen Air Views

In an informal debate Monday, Miller and Allen expressed their views which were in sharp contrast on the resolution.

Miller, who favors the resolution, expressed the opinion that, "the major problem facing the world is not that of gaining cooperation among western powers, it is rather the problem of achieving a working

agreement with Russia." "Without this agreement, by compromise, the course of world events must lead to the inevitability of a third and perhaps final world war." Any action deliberately to alter the delicate balance achieved in the organization of the United Nations, Miller continued, without the consent of Russia would increase antagonism between Russia and the West and would lead to war.

Allen—on the opposite side of the fence—opposed the resolution because he believes it is a compromise to Russia. "Up to the time that Czechoslovakia was taken over by the Communists," Allen stated, "there might have been home hope of appeasement. But after three years of compromise, the only result was the enlargement of the Russian sphere."

UN Reorganization Needed

The UN must be reorganized on a workable basis, Allen said, and, if this calls for the exclusion of Russia, then it (United Nations) must be formed among the western powers. With this statement, Miller interrupted Allen asking him if he realized that the big problem was between Russia and the western powers, how he could recommend action that would exclude and ignore Russia.

To this Allen replied that the UN must be made so strong that Russia would be forced to join and cooperate with the other nation members. "In other words," Miller questioned "you (Allen) feel that for the 251st time an international organization has failed to achieve peace through peaceful means and that one of the two hostile forces is going to be so strong that the other will give up and join out of sheer fright, is that right?"

Russian Veto at Fault

"If it has failed," Allen returned, "it has been only the fault of the continued Russian veto. With the advent of atomic power some step must be taken to obtain a more powerful world government and a strong, powerful UN would be the first step. . . . Russia, he said, would not start a war with a powerful UN in control of atomic energy.

"Yes," Miller replied, "but how is the UN without Russia going to

control Russian atomic energy " The answer is to stop Russia before she gets atomic energy by enforcement of decisions by a competent international police force, Allen added.

"I conclude from your statements," Miller replied, "that you think that the only way we're going

DAILY EMERALD

Tuesday, May 11, 1948 Page 7

to have peace is by fighting Russia and beating her."

"Not necessarily," Allen returned, "because I believe that if Russia sees a strong UN, she would be willing to join rather than fight."

Ackerman to Speak

Glenn C. Ackerman, Republican candidate for governor, will speak at a Vet's for Ackerman club meeting Tuesday evening. His speech, which will be of special interest to veteran students.

All over America... Smokers Report

# NO CIGARETTE

# HANGOVER

when you smoke PHILIP MORRIS!

—because PHILIP MORRIS is  
**DEFINITELY LESS IRRITATING**

than any other leading brand!

All over America, smokers who have changed to PHILIP MORRIS tell us . . . they now enjoy a milder smoke, a fresher, cleaner smoke than they've ever known before.

Yes, there's a difference in PHILIP MORRIS that distinguishes it from all other leading brands!

If you're tired of "cigarette hangover"—that stale, musty taste in your mouth—that dry smoked-out feeling in your throat . . . join the millions who CALL FOR PHILIP MORRIS, and remember:

Of all leading cigarettes, PHILIP MORRIS—and only PHILIP MORRIS—is recognized by eminent nose and throat specialists as definitely less irritating!

NO OTHER CIGARETTE CAN MAKE THAT STATEMENT!

Read What One of America's Top-Ranking Doctors Says About PHILIP MORRIS

"I have often suggested to patients who smoke that they change to PHILIP MORRIS. I have seen the results of such a change—and the results have convinced me that PHILIP MORRIS Cigarettes are less irritating than the other brands."

From one of a series of PROFESSIONAL STATEMENTS by EMINENT NOSE and THROAT SPECIALISTS.



JUST THINK OF IT!  
THEN COME IN AND  
BUY IT

**Del's Inn**

774 E. 11th

Across from Sigma Nu



CALL FOR PHILIP MORRIS

You'll be glad TOMORROW—you smoked PHILIP MORRIS TODAY!