

The State Board --- And Higher Education

As any history student knows, the past and present often foretell the future. For this reason, sincere friends of higher education in this state are justly concerned about the State Board of Higher Education's decision to grant Oregon State College a major in physical education.

The question is not the wisdom, or lack of wisdom, in granting Oregon State a PE department. The question concerns the wisdom in making the second major break in two years in an educational system that has been applauded by educators all over the nation.

Granting Oregon State a PE department represents in fact a junking of the basic principle of higher education in Oregon . . . allocation of funds and functions. This allocation prevents duplication and assures the highest possible educational quality in a state that can't afford unlimited spending.

Two years ago Oregon State College asked the State Board for a full school of business. They were repeatedly turned down, but the requests continued. Eventually the State Board was swayed and two schools of business were set up in the system.

The same pattern developed concerning the physical education request. Last year, Oregon State's request for a PE school was turned down by the State Board. More than that, the school was told not to ask again.

But again persistence proved its value. By the State Board's action there are now two competing schools of physical education in the state. As in 1948, the real issue was ducked. Rationalizations were put forward to show that there are not two competing schools. By their very existence, however, the schools compete in fact if not in theory.

Now, there's nothing wrong with competing schools within a state . . . if the state can afford them. At the present time, and for the foreseeable future, Oregon cannot afford the luxury of educational competition. Such competition sends school catalogs spiraling as course after course is added, always with the purpose of keeping two offerings ahead of the someone else.

In such a situation, quality of education goes into a spiral, too. It goes into the tailspin spiral, and is checked only when the ruinous competition and duplication is stopped.

The allocation and unification principle was set up during the depression to keep Oregon's higher education from going completely bankrupt. Unlike many stop-gap measures, the idea was a success. There were scoffers at first, but the effectiveness of the plan in improving Oregon's schools brought more and more acclaim.

Adjustments were made when and where necessary, but only when clearly required by sound educational policy. Until 1948 there were no professional school "grabs." Moreover, the professional schools were recognized as the last area where duplication would be excusable.

It seems strange, then, that the two major breaks in the system have been in the professional school area. The PE request was unusually brazen. One of the chief reasons given for setting up the PE department at Corvallis according to a news service quoting a college spokesman was ". . . to attract athletes who want to train for high school teaching and coaching." One wonders what sound educational values can come from such an attitude.

But PE arguments are a thing of the past. The question becomes; where will it stop? Oregon State has already been turned down once on its request of a school of journalism. There are indications that art and architecture are next on the list.

A certain amount of duplication is necessary. All students need background courses, but the elusive "background" excuse can't be given for duplication in the professional school area. In those schools, quality demands concentration and unification. The State Board's most recent action is another step toward destroying that unification.

In the matter of the PE request, the past accurately foretold the present. For the well-being of higher education in Oregon, we hope it doesn't foretell the future.—Jim Wallace.

Sophomore Wisdom

Spring is Just Around the Corner

by Bob Funk



Spring is almost here. We saw a robin. In fact, we have seen a great many robins lately, and other kinds of birds, too. Either they have their signals all fouled up (and we do NOT believe in puns) and are under the impression that this is Carmel-by-the-Sea, or spring is coming.

Just any day now the temperature will soar up to some unearthly heat like sixteen above, and the crocuses (or croci, if you think this comes from some old Latin root—again, no intended pun) and tulips and other bright and fresh things will be pushing their little green heads up everywhere.

Love may again gain some of its lost popularity. As of now, a snowdrift by the Ol' Mill-race or an icy plot in the cemetery are not too appealing, and romance is on the decline. However, barring unnatural decisions by the groundhog, the weather man, and the Office of Student Affairs, both spring and love

should be right around the corner. After all, we saw a robin.

Yes temperatures will rise again, glands will begin to do whatever glands do in the spring (and this seems to be quite a bit) and by June even our little toes may be thawed out.

Maybe we are being overly optimistic. We think not. It isn't really cold outside; just crisp. And it's such fun to watch people fall with resounding thuds upon the ice. It is a time for great gaiety and celebration, for spring is coming.

All those icicles that people keep trying to stab each other with will melt. It will be possible to walk up Alder street without feeling like someone being hunted by the Royal Mounted Police.

As one of those people in the English Lit book said, "O west wind, if winter comes, can spring be far behind?"

Remember, we saw a robin.

In the Bag

Block Out the Circle

A Letter

January 30, 1950

AN OPEN LETTER
Student Affairs Committee
University of Oregon
Dear Committee Members:

It has been the hope of the Young Progressives to present on campus, to the students and faculty of the University, a non-partisan discussion of the timely question, "Should We Recognize the New China?" Despite the fact that three faculty members, representing divergent opinions, were to speak, the University Administration denied us the use of campus facilities for the reason that the Young Progressives are not a recognized campus organization.

Over three months ago, Young Progressives complied with all procedures set forth by the administration as necessary to obtain recognition. After this was done, the Student Affairs Committee decided that recognition was not necessary as a condition for the use of campus facilities. Whereupon, Young Progressives asked for a room in which to hold a public meeting. This request was denied on the grounds that Young Progressives was not a recognized campus organization. Clarification of our status was requested. We were informed that the Student Affairs Committee again took up the matter, but came to no definite conclusion. However we were told by Mr. Dushane, Director of

Student Affairs, that upon request of our faculty adviser we could obtain a campus-room for non-political meetings. On the basis of this, our faculty adviser requested a room for a non-partisan discussion on the subject of Chinese recognition. This request was denied on the ground that Young Progressives are not a recognized campus organization. The cir-

cle is complete.

We think that the Administration owes it to the students to decide, as soon as possible, the status of political clubs on the campus. (We were informed that, as yet, no political clubs are recognized, and thus can not use campus facilities even for non-political meetings.)

Since it is the function of a
(Please turn to page three)

Off to a Good Start

Voting booths in the Vet's Dorms have been the aim of dorm men for some years, but because of objections of one kind or another the booths were never placed there.

One of the main objections in previous years has been the impossibility of getting poll books for more than the usual (year before) number of polls. This problem has been neatly taken care of this year by use of IBM machines, which apparently do have some good use besides punching up registration cards to the point where they are unreadable.

The Executive Council took the very practical and thoughtful approach to the setting up of polls this year for freshman elections. By putting them in three different locations, it is hoped that voting will be so convenient that no student will feel the polls are inaccessible.

If Freshmen learn early that the actual process of voting can be painless and does not entail registration-like lines in some building a mile from nowhere, they will be more inclined to take an active participation in every election.

(We do not intend to imply that voting is easy in all its aspects; for the conscientious voter must study the qualifications and platforms of the candidates if he is to vote wisely, and this is not always an easy task.)

But this year's freshmen are certainly getting off on the right foot, by all pre-election evidence.

If we may be allowed a comment on the candidates—all four seem especially well qualified on the basis of past activities; whether or not their platforms are as insipid as usual we do not yet know.

With seemingly good candidates and accessible polling booths, the election would be complete with reasonable platforms.

Oregon Daily EMERALD

The OREGON DAILY EMERALD, published daily during the college year except Saturdays, Sundays, holidays and final examination periods by the Associated Students, University of Oregon. Subscription rates: \$2.00 a term, \$4.00 for two terms and \$5.00 a year. Entered as second class matter at the postoffice Eugene, Oregon.

Opinions expressed in editorials are those of the writer, and do not claim to represent the opinions of the ASUO or of the University. Initialed editorials are written by associate editors. Unsigned editorials are written by the editor.

Opinions expressed in an editorial page by-lined column are those of the columnist, and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the editor or his associates.

DON A. SMITH, Editor

JOAN MIMNAUGH, Business Manager

BARBARA HEYWOOD, HELEN SHERMAN, Associate Editors.

GLENN GILLESPIE, Managing Editor

DON THOMPSON, Advertising Manager