An Editorial

Sometimes We Wonder if Things Mean What They Say

Taken by itself the policy statement of the State Board of Higher Education is reassuring. The reader, who reads only the statement which appeared in these columns Tuesday, learns that the state board is the foe of costly duplication of services in the state institutions, that the board is concerned only with educating as many young people as possible within the rather confining budgets which higher education must accept in this relatively impoverished state.

But unfortunately, the careful reader cannot afford to take this statement "by itself." He must view it in light of the actions of the board.

The statement, released to the major newspapers of the state and to the college dailies with a "please publish" note, proclaims piously that the board will consider some "necessary duplication" when it is "on the basis of proven needs" and then "only after careful study."

A few moments before this pious declaration was read, the board had voted to establish major work in physical education at Oregon State College. At no time, in no public meeting of that body, did anybody demonstrate anything about "proven needs," nor was there any indication that the new allocation had come only after "careful study." There was no attempt, so far as the public knows, to show that the physical education facilities at the University of Oregon were inadequate to take care of the needs of the state. There was no indication of overcrowded conditions in this field, on the Eugene campus.

Near the end of the statement the board explains that "It also is the continuing purpose of the Board to keep the two major institutions distinctive in their highly professional fields and to develop quality in these fields." Viewed in light of the earlier action of the board (not to mention the action two years ago which established what amounts to a duplicate business school at the state college) that statement is contradictory.

No reasonable person could quarrel with duplications in the two institutions which are necessary to provide the general "background" necessary to all educated persons.

The board tosses in more double-talk about the costs of educating "a student." It costs no more to educate a student at one institution than it does at another. Therefore, the reasoning seems to be, the state can educate two students at two different places as cheaply as it can educate two students at one place. In other words two persons can live separately as cheaply as two can live together.

Well, how about it? "Assuming there are sufficient numbers of students to guarantee adequate size of classes and effective utilization of facilities and faculties," can we please have an engineering school here? How about agriculture? There are many farms in Lane County, and our Lane County boys need to know the science of soils and fertilizers and baby chicks.

Where the argument bogs down, of course, is in the very significant difference in the two institutions. The University administration has for five years been stressing quality education, seeking to strengthen the schools and departments which already exist. The administration here will not attempt to do things it cannot do well. It would rather spend the time and the money in fields where the demand is not met elsewhere.

Quite the opposite is the situation down the river. Empire Builders at Oregon State College seem to feel that they want as many areas as possible assigned to them. Whether there is money for the duplications, is of small importance.

This page has no beef with the appropriation of money for Oregon State College—in the proper areas. But lets not see the state's money dissipated by duplicating professional work in the areas already served adequately by another institution.

(This guest editorial, submitted by a student of the University, so completely expresses the feelings of the editorial staff we think no other comment is necessary.—The Editor.)

How to Perpetuate?

The Student Union Board is having difficulties.

This is only natural, since the SU board has so many problems that lead to difficulties.

But the difficulty we are at present most interested in concerns perpetuation of the board.

It seems the SU board must be representative of the students.

This, almost everyone will agree, is a good idea—students on the student union board representing students.

But how to select those students? Here we run into difficulties.

By general election? This might lead to politics, and the function of the board is non-political.

By appointment by Deans of Schools, President of the University, or some other person? This would tend to leave student voice out in the rain.

Have the board choose its own successors? This would allow a stinker on the board to choose someone even worse; and lead to other evils of self-perpetuation.

How then?

Selection of members by a joint committee of Student Union Board members and Executive Council members? This sounds like a reasonable plan.

It avoids the politics of a general election; it places the responsibility in the hands of student leaders who are representatives of the students; it places the Student Union Board and the Executive Council in proper relationship to one another.

There are details to be worked out:

How many students? What groups shall they represent? Upperclassmen or lowerclassmen or both? Qualifications? Methods of getting names before the joint committee? And more, and more, and more.

But the details are important. For the Student Union Board must be a board that does represent the students; a board which the students have had their say in appointing.

The Student Union is an important phase of student government; it must work within the realm of student government.

It is the task of this first board to set the proper relationship between student government and student union.

A joint committee would be a proper first move.

Who's in Charge Here?

How to Keep Attendance Regular

By Rod Smith

You get a "B" in your midterm and a "B" in your final and your grade for the term comes out a "C". You go to see your professor to find out "wha hoppen" and are told in pear shaped (how now etc.) tones that, because you missed two classes and were late for another one, your actual grade was dropped a notch down the scale. You plead, beg, grovel, weep, gnash teeth, and prostrate your "worthy" instructor but to no avail. You are informed that he will not tolerate students who miss class; that you couldn't possibly have gotten enough information out of the course to get an honest "B" unless you had attended all the lectures; and that why should he do you favors when you aren't interested enough in the course to come to class. To him the matter is closed.

I wonder if the professors who cause the above scene to be reenacted many times each term realize that **they** are the cause for the student's absence from class. A person attends college to secure as much higher education as possible; both academic and social. He has completed his schooling as required by law. He attends college to enable himself to get a better job than someone who has no degree or to qualify himself for a high paying job that requires technical knowledge which only college can give him. He has no time to waste! He must use every minute profitably! He can't squander valuable time going to class where the professor drones on and on about nothing with a "don't ask questions but take my word for it" attitude. The student goes to class to learn, not to be put to sleep.

Professors take note! If your classroom always seems to be almost empty, don't be hasty and unjustly penalize the missing students. Maybe you are a "drone." Maybe your lectures sprinkle sand around the room and cause droopy eyelids. Maybe more punch in your lectures would draw a larger bunch of students to your classes. The prudent student is going to get all that he can out of college. If your lectures offer him nothing but sedentary "sack-time" can you blame him for spending his time someplace else? He's probably doing some outside reading for your course and, if not, even a cup of muddy "joe" will do more for him that your lecture. It will at least keep his "peepers" open.

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*

News Editors: Anne Goodman, Ken Metzler. Sports Editors: John Barton, Sam Fidman.
Assistant News Editor: Mary Ann Delsman. Chief Night Editor: Lorna Larson.
Assistant Managing Editors: Hal Coleman, Tom King, Bill Stanfield, Stan Turnbull. Copy Editor: Marjory Bush.
Emerald Photographer: Gene Rose. Desk Editors: Marjory Bush, Bob Funk, Gretchen Grondahl, Lorna Larson, Larry Meiser.
Women's Editor: June Fitzgibbons.

In the Bag

A Letter

Unhappy About Sports Coverage

"So the Sammies were really hot—nothing less—as they solidly whacked Alpha 39-13." It isn't enough that the Sammies should beat Alpha, but the paper proudly announces such a top-heavy score. It is amazing but true that Alpha piled up 20 points to 39 for those maple mighties, the Sammies. Let us also point out that Alpha's John Shepherd scored 12 points to keep pace with those immortal Sammies, Harold Mink with 14 points and Gerald Ginzberg with 10 points.

Sincerely yours,
Roe Jensen,
Alpha Hall

The Emerald is sorry it made an inaccuracy in reporting the score of the game. The score was obtained from the scorebook, and the error was there. John Shepherd did score 12 points, as you mentioned.

Any partiality that appeared in the story was unintentional; the writer was attempting to report objectively. He may have let his enthusiasm carry him away.

The Emerald sports staff attempts always to report events objectively. If they do have a personal interest in the outcome (and they usually do not) they subjugate their personal interests when writing the story.—Editor.