

Who Should Change?

The underlying significance of the situation in the school of physical education is of more importance than whether or not these particular five women must change their major.

We do not contest the right of a school to recommend a change of major to its students for just cause. But have these girls been given just reasons?

The girls say they have not. The Dean of the school, R. W. Leighton, gave two reasons, one obvious.

The other—that the girls are not the type of persons which the school could recommend—is nebulous and leaves room for doubt.

What type of person does the school want?

A physical education graduate is a key person in the school in which he may instruct because of his interest in curricular and extra-curricular activities, the Dean claims. For that reason he may be the key to success of the disciplinary and administrative program of the school.

The instructor must have an abiding, primary interest in what he teaches; he must accept constructive criticism easily in dealing with the administration; and he must willingly make the most of the program he has to work with.

In college, the Dean continues, the PE student must make the most of his training and utilize constructive criticism.

We have no argument with the Dean on any of these points; we doubt if the women do either. But what they, and we, would like to know is, just where have they fallen down in meeting these qualifications?

The girls say their advisers did not give them reasons for the request to change their major, other than the girls had been "disloyal, uncooperative, and did not have the proper attitude" toward the school.

Exactly when they had been disloyal, in exactly what instances they had been uncooperative, and just exactly what was the matter with their attitude, the advisers did not point out.

If a student raises a fuss with the administrative practices of the school here, the Dean believed, then that student would probably give the administration trouble when she enters the teaching field.

Which sounds to us like this—if you have guts enough to speak up and say what you don't like about the school, there's a pretty good chance you'll get kicked out because of an "improper attitude."

The Dean mentioned the ability of the girls to take constructive criticism when they enter the profession. Well, the instructors, professors, and Dean are in the profession, might they not, by their own standards, be expected to take constructive criticism?

Certainly the girls should make the most of their PE program. But does that not entail pointing out what they may consider flaws, in the hope that those flaws may be corrected and the program bettered?

And simply because they realize, and say, that this PE school may not be God's complete answer to a PE maiden's prayer, should they be asked to change their major?

These girls who spoke out their constructive criticism of the school were not showing disrespect for the school. They were showing an extremely proper attitude, one of improvement.

The University should teach an individual to think on his own. Not to meekly accept any rotten thing that is handed down to him. In the efforts of these girls to improve their school are crushed now, what kind of an education are they getting?

We do not make progress in a Democracy by purging any persons who dare question. We listen to their questions.

If there are to be changes in our PE school, it appears there may be found more valuable places for the change than in the attitude of some students.

Our Readers Speak

Gestapo Ways, Fluorescent Lights

The Right to Criticize

To the Editor:

In Thursday's Emerald, it quoted two reasons given by Dean Leighton why several girls were expelled from the PE department: (1) Some girls have indicated they do not intend to take the complete PE requirements and (2) some girls appear to be of the type of PE major which the school could not recommend to administrators after the girls graduate.

Concerning the second reason, I know one of the girls fairly well and have watched her in almost every major sport. The PE department would not have to be ashamed to recommend her ability to play or to teach others how to play a game, and maybe the same thing can go for the others. At least she would never have to teach from a book like some PE teachers, as she knows her sports. In fact, she has taught our house teams, volleyball, basketball and softball, some very good plays and the finer points of the sports.

Maybe she did object to taking physics, but most students would unless they were vitally interested in that field, and since this is supposed to be the land of free speech (?) it was her right and the rest of the girls' rights to voice their objection. It would appear that we have a small dictatorship forming in our PE department, or at least they are trying it out.

Most good PE departments generally have a special course of physics and chemistry reduced to the essentials necessary for the students. What is wrong with our PE department and chemistry departments? Are they behind times or just too lazy to do anything about such matters?

Frances Dunn

Purge in PE

We, as interested non-major bystanders, would like to draw attention to a situation in the women's health and physical education school and, if possible, be given the reason for certain actions taken this week.

Students are being expelled, we understand, for "lack of loyalty" to the department. This seems to involve correct procedure in saying "Good morning" to those in authority and in acting as informers to said authorities concerning student discussion of them. Students with relatively high GPA's are among those ousted and reasons for expulsion appear to be based entirely on personal prejudices.

The causes go back to a resentment felt by both students and faculty over an issue several weeks ago. But the resentment felt by the students was caused by the dictatorial fashion in which the matter was handled, not because the issue was refused. Now, Gestapo-like, the faculty has resorted to a purge. Some students have been expelled from the department; others have a choice between changing their "attitude" and changing their major.

We admit that we have heard only one side of the story, but we'd like facts to prove our impression a wrong one. Is "wrong attitude" as determined by one or two people considered adequate grounds for refusing a student with above average scholarship the chance to study what he wishes? Is personal prejudice sufficient basis for expelling a student from a professional school?

(Names withheld at request)

Dean Leighton wishes to make no statements concerning the academic requirements of the school, as he does not believe the Emerald a proper place to discuss such things.—Editor.

Starve 'em Out

The Emerald has been emphasizing the poor judgment shown by Glenn Winklebleck and fellow-students in referring a petition to the state newspapers on the quality of food served in dorms.

I'm not going to speculate on the effects of this because the Emerald has already expressed its view-point on the matter adequately enough. However, I would like to say something in general on the real root of the issue, that is "the food served in Veterans dorm," and in particular on a remark by H. P. Barnhart, dormitory foods director, printed in Thursday's Emerald.

Said Mr. Barnhart, in commenting on the supposition that food served in John Straub is better than that at Veterans Commons:

"It isn't true, the food is better. It is of exactly the same quality, but the atmosphere is much better at Straub. At the Commons it is noisy during meals and the fluorescent lights give the food a bad color."

Now really, is the effect of fluorescent lighting responsible for seeing one paper-thin piece of butter, one egg for breakfast, or a grade-school-boy's portion of chow on the plate? If the effect of noise had anything to do with a man's appetite surely thousands of GI's must have eaten elsewhere than in the facilities provided. Maybe the presence of women makes those who eat in Straub more tolerable! Certainly the atmosphere there is much better! No eyes glaring at you from behind the chow line like you were ready to make off with two pieces of butter. There you eat eggs for breakfast and more if you want. There they put food on the plate, not keep it in the pots and pans to make soup of.

I'll agree with those who say the quality of food in the two mess halls is noticeably different. But I will stress the difference in quantity and am prone to think most gripes come regarding the latter.

The "feeling of being starved" is a major reason the former tenants of Vets dorm moved to John Straub; and it's on this reason, not especially the edibility of the food, that most of the 397 who signed Winklebleck's petition did so.

Bill Frye.

They Have Steaks, of a Sort, at the Vets' Commons This Week

It's gratifying—and a little amusing—to hear that food has markedly improved at Vets dorms in the last two days.

There was steak at the commons Wednesday night when Hendricks and Straub had stew. And the steaks were reportedly very tasty—even under fluorescent lights.

Maybe the state-wide publicity had its effect. But it didn't have effect enough. It was promised at the Interdorm Council meeting Wednesday that the food problem would be investigated and that existing shortcomings would be corrected any way possible within the budget.

That shows good motives on the part of the administration.

But yesterday we could find no evidence of a formal investigation being put in motion. It appeared that the matter merely had been turned over to the

food director and the business manager with the rather loose admonition that they do what they saw fit.

Maybe within the budget they'll find that they will be able to do little. Maybe they will make some changes, but just the changes that meet with their approval, and not with the approval of the aggrieved students. Maybe they will work hard at reform for a month or so, and then drop the matter.

Too many University "investigations" have been handled this way. Either nothing comes of them, or when changes, wrought gradually, are finally accomplished the students don't realize that anything has happened. They keep on griping.

We recommend that the investigators of dorm food announce definitely their plan of research. When they find that food can or cannot be improved within the budget, when they decide that the at-

mosphere can or cannot be made more pleasant in vets commons, they report their decisions and their reasons to Interdorm Council.

And we recommend that students cooperate in the investigation.

The first student to be given a part in the study should be Glenn Winklebleck. If he's just a rabble-rouser, as some officials have indicated, perhaps he will be convinced that he has no cause. If he's a man with purpose and initiative—as his action indicated to a large extent—perhaps he will be useful.

But the University, unless it wants the steam to collect slowly for another blow-up in another year, should be definite in its actions.

And it should announce any improvement effected. Why be modest? It's the University's neck under the axe when its shortcomings must be aired in Portland papers to bring results—B.H.