

Extensive Guidance Program Needed--

Our Inefficient Advising System Claims a Victim

By Kirk Braun

A 17-year-old freshman left school yesterday, largely because of an inefficient advising system and the "passing of the buck" by both his adviser and the department of geography and geology. The blame does not lie entirely with these two parties, however. A variety of underlying causes contributed to the situation; a situation, which if repeated, will not win friends for the University of Oregon (NOR WILL IT BUILD STRONG STUDENTS OR GOOD CITIZENSHIP).

The victim of the inconsistent system (organized chaos for freshman) whom we'll call Art, registered this term for 14 hours, including a four-hour course in geography. After two weeks he decided he should switch to geology, which he did. This was a

mistake and the volunteered advice from fraternity brothers didn't help the situation any.

Both his adviser and the department okayed the change, although his adviser suggested that these courses were not particularly useful in his pre-law curriculum.

After a rough exam, Art learned from the instructor that he was in the third term of a geology course, the members of which composed "the cream of the crop" from the previous two terms. Since he had neither of the two prerequisite terms, he was advised to drop the course.

It was too late to add courses and he couldn't afford to stay in school with only 10 hours. So he petitioned to add a two-hour hour course, Survey of Broad-

casting, which he immediately started attending.

The academic requirements committee turned down the petition.

Winter term, Art's first, he had a GPA of 1.60 on 14 hours, six of which were sophomore courses. Spring term he was making a decided effort to improve his academic standing. After all, 1.60 is no disgrace. Many a graduating senior did worse than this in his first term at the University.

Then why was this green freshman not given expert counseling and why was he allowed to get into a course in which he didn't belong?

Professor Allen Hugh Smith, his adviser, says that he usually leaves the course-sequence problem up to the department. Dr.

Samuel Dicken, head of the geology department, believes that the responsibility rests with the adviser . . . and the student. He admits that it is impossible to keep a faculty member present at the card-stamping table all during registration. A freshman girl often does the job.

Professor Smith has 65 advisees. With this many, it's only natural that one or two will slip through. But one slip is too many. AN EXTENSIVE AND CONCENTRATED GUIDANCE PROGRAM FOR FRESHMEN CERTAINLY IS NEEDED.

Sure, every freshman should study the catalog. But it takes most students three years to get enough education to be able to understand its intricacies. INTERPRETATION IS CERTAIN-

LY PART OF THE ADVISER'S JOB.

Considerable irony lies in the fact that although the instructor of the Survey of Broadcasting course, Bob Davy, felt that Art had not missed too much to catch up, the academic requirements committee turned him down. If petitions for adding courses are going to be considered, should not the instructor involved have a vote?

Well, by this time, Art is on his way home. He got \$18 of his \$42.50 tuition refunded but most of it went to pay pledging fines and other expenses incurred through no fault of his own. If he never comes back to Oregon, he certainly cannot be blamed.

The whole thing has a rather disagreeable odor.

Today's Elections

Today's ASUO elections climax several weeks of intensive campaigning by the two major campus political parties.

Aside from several minor "incidents" like the tearing down of posters on Monday night, the pre-election campaigns have been unusually free from the horseplay, petty bickering, and bitternesses of former years.

Perhaps it's a sign that student political leaders are attaining a degree of maturity not reached by many of their predecessors.

Although they contained the usual platitudes, of course, the platforms published in Tuesday's Emerald appeared to have been carefully drawn up and each contained worthwhile suggestions which will deserve consideration by next year's student government.

Any attempt on the part of the Emerald to evaluate the two platforms or the candidates of the two parties could lead only to confusion.

Instead, we suggest that each voter today carefully weigh for himself the issues at stake and the merits of the various candidates, and then vote as his conscience dictates.

Although the Emerald is not concerned with how a student casts his ballot today, we are hopeful that a greater number of persons than usual show an interest in student government by exercising their right to vote.

To every student on this campus we say: You owe it to yourself and to your fellow students to vote in today's election.

If campus politics served no other purpose, it could be justified on the grounds that it offers the student an opportunity to exercise the most cherished right a democracy can bestow—the right to vote.

Religion's 'New Look'

Sure, and the world really must be changing. It has been found necessary for the first time in 60 years to revise the Roman Catholic Catechism—the book that gives Catholic doctrinal answers.

Basic beliefs remain the same, but problems have come up in the last 60 years that need clarification. And then, other matters have been resolved, and are not maintained in the revision.

Television is an example of the new look in doctrine. The revised edition of the catechism states that a person must be bodily present at the place where mass is celebrated to fulfill his attendance obligation. Though television is not mentioned specifically, this obviously rules out hearing mass in the comfort of your living room via video.

The new catechism shows more awareness of the problems of labor.

The old book stated that according to agreements, servants or workmen must serve faithfully and honestly, and that employers must see they are kindly and fairly treated and justly paid their wages at the proper time.

But the new book looks at it from the other side. It says, "Employers who defraud laborers by not paying them a just living wage keep what belongs to others and are guilty of grave injustice not only to the employe, but also to the members of his family."

The employe is admonished, however, that he will be violating the "thou shalt not steal commandment" by loafing on the job, and being careless with his employer's property.

Now we'll see what the next 60 years will bring . . .

Chinese Tragedy Began In 1937

(Editorial note: Columnist Callahan, a sophomore in history, has spent about ten years of his life in the Philippines and the Orient.)

By Michael Callahan

The tragedy that is today being enacted on the shores of the Yangtze river in China began more than ten years ago. On the morning of December 12 1937, a squadron of Japanese planes roared down upon the anchored American gunboat Panay and blew it apart. Within a week the White Man had made his answer . . . we demanded apologies and money.

To the Chinese peasant army, hard pressed by the Nipponese tanks and poison gas, it meant the end of the last great hope for peace. And in Tokyo the war words dreamed of a vast new empire with white men made slaves.

We survived only after fighting up the bloody trail that began on Guadalcanal and ended with a billion-dollar bomb over Hiroshim.

The cycle of history now has brought us back to the same crisis on the same river. Within the past few days the British have lost more than 100 men dead and wounded, and have suffered heavy damage to four ships, after Chinese Communist artillery sprang an ambush in the Yangtze narrows. One ship and 60 men still lie trapped beneath the Chinese guns, and their fate depends on the whim of some Red officer.

The question is . . . where do we go from here, THIS TIME?

We can't see that the Communist trap was any accident. By a single clever stroke they have destroyed what little prestige the white men had left in the Orient, and have kicked the British lion in its most tender spot, the navy. The Chinese guns successfully stood off the finest British ships that could rush to the scene, and thus have put the rest of the world squarely on the spot.

Winston Churchill today will demand an explanation from the British government for the Yangtze disaster. For what it is worth, we would like to pass on our own proposed solution to the mess. We might say in passing that we base this on the experience gained in more than ten years spent living in the Orient. It is high time that the British

think back to the days of Rudyard Kipling and the old Empire, of "far-flung battle lines" and "regiments of British infantry." The Communists have attacked the Empire . . . well then, fling the challenge back in their teeth!

Considering the millions of Red troops deployed along the Yangtze, British soldiers would have little chance to drive home a lesson. The navy has shown itself unable to force a passage up the river. Therefore, that leaves only the air force. And the Chinese Reds have flew, if any, planes.

It is in the air, then, that the British should answer the aggressors. Squadrons of bombers from Hong Kong and from the

aircraft carriers reported on the way to China should spend a few leisurely days scourging the offending artillery positions. A few days' work with bombs, and machine guns would show the Reds the error of their ways.

This is admittedly reactionary, and has little to do with the Brotherhood of Man. But it is also necessary if the prestige of western culture is to remain in the Orient, and if the same tragic path of appeasement that we followed after the Panay attack is not to be repeated. This time the score must be evened and respect restored.

Footnote: A wise man once said that history repeats itself.

From Our Mailbag

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dear Mr. Editor:

As two former Emerald editors who still read the shack's daily production with consuming interest, we were fascinated to read yours of the 22nd, in which you announced an Emerald policy of neutrality with the contention that politics at Oregon are farce produced by infantile student governors, and as such are not worthy of positive comment via the editorial page.

No one has bemoaned the immense stupidity and laxness of student councils and campus political leaders more than we . . . but when did the policy of non-attention ever correct what are coyly called "existing evils"?

It is one thing to hop on a political band wagon for the ride and the journalistic (?) experience—it is another thing to weigh issues (or the lack of issues) and as editor evaluate them from a viewpoint of student interest—it is still another thing to sit on the fence out of fear that some of the boys might get rough.

We would question whether the Emerald position over a period of fifteen years has been a generally neutral one, in politics or the latest coed styles. When so many people gather in one spot—with varying backgrounds, ambitions and patterns of behavior—there's bound to be at the very least a difference of opinion. The editor's job, and his most important challenge, is the evaluation of these differences.

The "fightin' editor," who nonetheless gives his critics their day in court with news stories and often with editorial space, has seldom lacked the respect, however grudging, of the student body he serves as an individual and as a citizen of the University community.

Yours truly,

Marjorie Goodwin
Bob Frazier

(Editor's note: Marjorie Goodwin edited the Emerald in 1943-44, Frazier in 1947-48. Both are presently employed by the Eugene Register-Guard.)

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: \$2.00 per term and \$4.00 per year. Entered as second-class matter at the post office, Eugene, Oregon.

BILL YATES, Editor

VIRGIL TUCKER, Business Manager

Associate Editors: June Goetze, Boblee Brophy, Diana Dye, Barbara Heywood
Advertising Manager: Cork Mobley

BOB REED, Managing Editor
Assistant Managing Editors: Stan Turnbull, Don Smith

BOB TWEDELL, City Editor
Assistant City Editors: Ken Metzler, Ann Goodman

NEWS EDITORS
Cluck Grell, Hal Coleman, Steve Loy, Vic Fryer, Diane Mechem