

Constitution--A Fair Trial? *In the Bag*

Today student government goes up for trial. And there's lots hanging in the balance—namely, the guidepost by which your student government will conduct itself in both the immediate and also distant future. It is on the acceptance or rejection of the ASUO Constitution, to be voted upon at the polls today, that this rests.

As a jury—for that is what you are today—you owe it to yourself, to your fellow students, and to the University to familiarize yourself with the proposed constitution, weigh the facts of the case, and then return a decision.

Basically, the changes incorporated in the new constitution call for :

The formation of a senate, a president's cabinet, a student judiciary, a petition system for ASUO elections, and a more flexible amendment procedure.

The abolition of the Executive Council and the positions of student body secretary-treasurer and second vice-president.

This means:

1) A legislative body more representative of the students would replace an Executive Council whose operation has been limited by its size. The council is too small for legislative tasks, too large for administrative tasks; the latter would now be turned over to the president and his cabinet.

2) Candidates for ASUO posts would file for office by submitting petitions.

3) Amendment procedure would be made more flexible. Only one-third instead of one-half of the students would be required to vote; two-thirds of them would be required to give approval.

4) The ASUO would be in closer working rapport with such organizations as the Co-op and the Student Union Board.

Thus, the proposed constitution offers many advantages now unprovided for in the present one.

However, the ultimate decision rests with the students.

But there are danger points.

They lay in the possibility that you will shirk the duty and responsibility that is yours.

They lay in the possibility that the student body—the jury—will not reach a decision, either for or against.

For if less than one-half of the student body go to the polls today, the proposed constitution will automatically fail to go into effect.

This, then, would not be a decision by a jury. Instead, it would be the failure of a jury to reach a decision—and by so doing put the skids under student government and point up the apathy with which the jury regards its case.

If the constitution is defeated today by a vote embracing at least half the student body—then the decision will have been justified.

But if it is defeated because of the sole fact that less than half the students voted—then the decision is an irresponsible one.

These are the facts of the trial. The case is in your hands—it is your job to return the decision.

Let's hope by nightfall you'll be able to say: "Well done."—T.K.

* * * *

If the word gets around, Sen McCarthy will probably want to start investigating Gloria Grimson, candidate for Junior Weekend Queen. A mysterious sign with Russian characters was posted yesterday in Friendly Hall, with the ominous (and un-American?) lettering "Russian Language students support Gloria for Queen of Siberia."

Columnists On the Receiving Line

Two Letters

The Case Against Kane

To the Editor:

Mr. Hank Kane condemned, in Monday's Emerald, the undergraduate creative writing major which is to be inaugurated next fall. Mr. Kane's presentation of the picture is inadequate if not totally erroneous. Since an exhaustive comment upon his article would require more space than the Emerald affords, I shall discuss only a few ideas.

What does Mr. Kane have against such a major? There is no question, as I see it, except the supposition that "little more than a skill is acquired. Writing is a mechanical process displaying thoughts in a convenient form for examination by others." Mr. Kane is to be complimented upon his definition of writing, for an adequate definition of this process has defied the best efforts of great thinkers and writers through the ages.

Mr. Kane says: "Good writing derives from imagination drawing on insight, observation, and experience, not solely from courses on how to write." Almost any critic will agree to the derivation as Mr. Kane put it. However, he would have us believe that inspiration of genius alone is necessary; perspiration does not enter into the question.

This belief would serve only to fatten the

heads of aspiring writers if they believed it, and those who have written a sustained work know better. He should have said that good writing derives from these sources and a thorough understanding of the mechanical processes involved, and also from the ability of the writer to take advantage of these processes.

Writing is, and necessarily must be, the synthesis of thought and mechanics of expression, for even our thought is stated in terms of mechanical or artificial symbols. Even da Vinci wielded a brush, and where would Rubenstein be without his fingers or his keyboard? Mr. Kane oversimplified the question to the detriment of clarity or understanding.

Mr. Kane suggests that "any bellhop, taxi-driver, or attorney has seen more story material on a par with Dreiser's 'An American Tragedy' in one week than the average undergraduate passes by, unseeing, in a year." But what happens if this bellhop, taxi-driver, or attorney cannot write an intelligible sentence? We hope, for the sake of the profession, that the lawyer can. Perhaps Mr. Kane has not read of the long and arduous period of ap-

(Please turn to page three)

The Case Against Weitzner

Dear "Former Friends":

This concerns creative writing and people from Brooklyn and girls named Kahelia who have been dead for fifty years. In Monday's Emerald, Hank Kane was squelched by creative writing professor Robeson Bailey. This was all well and good. But in yesterday's issue, the constant purveyor of misinformation concerning the University Radio Studios took it upon himself to criticize an original radio script called "The Isle Of Kaheila." Now appears to be the time to squelch Marty Weitzner.

In the first place, Marty may have glanced through the Kahelia script, but he couldn't have read it. The names Marty mentioned were the same as in the original script, but that is where the similarity ended. Second, a radio script is written to be heard—not read. Only experienced radio producers have the faculty to determine if a script is good or not by reading it. Marty Weitzner is not an experienced radio producer.

One point which makes Marty's whole article unjustified is that he neglected to mention that the show was a fantasy. The only evidence of fantasy in his article was his fantastic misinformation.

And just to get the facts clear—Kahelia was not heard over KERG last Sunday. It is scheduled later in the term. Another point—KERG regularly schedules University Radio Workshop dramas every Sunday—not just when KOAC has baseball games. And finally, Kaheila will be heard over KOAC this Thursday at 4:30.

No, "The Isle of Kaheila" certainly couldn't be compared with Norman Corwin. Imitation isn't considered as ethical in radio as it evidently is in journalism. In fact, Kaheila was nothing exceptional as far as radio writing is concerned—but it was original. If a comparison is to be made, try holding up Marty's article to the standards of good, factual, journalism.

A few of Villard Hall's displaced persons,

Dick Hardie,
Dick Zarones,
Janet Harris,
Lorin Miller,
John Roaney,
Alan B. Hicks,
Jim Bleu,
Elmarie Wendel
Ray Hamilton.



The OREGON DAILY EMERALD, published daily during the college year except all Saturdays but Junior Weekend, Sunday, holidays, final examination periods, Monday preceding Junior weekend in May, and the last Thursday in May by the Associated Students, University of Oregon. 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

ANNE GOODMAN, TOM KING, Associate Editors

GLENN GILLESPIE, Managing Editor

Shirley Hillard, Advertising Manager

News Editors: Lorna Larson, Ken Metzler,
Assistant News Editor: Gretchen Grondahl,
Assistant Managing Editors: Norman Anderson,
Hal Coleman, Mac Epley,
Merle Gors, Walt McKinney, Bill Stanfield.

Sports Editors: John Barton, Sam Fidman,
Chief Night Editor: Mary Hall,
Copy Editor: Marjory Bush,
Desk Editors: Marjory Bush, Bill Frye,
Gretchen Grondahl, Larry Meiser, Jackie Pritzen.

Office Manager: Karla Van Loan,
National Advertising Manager: Bonnie Birko-
meier,
Assistant Business Manager: Don Thompson

Zone managers: Sue Bachelder, Virginia Kel-
logg, Jeanne Hoffman, Fran Neel, Barbara
Williams, Margie Wells,
Layout manager: Martel Scroggin,
Circulation Manager: Jean Lovell

The Cinemah

The Redhead and the Reformer

by George Spelvin

Last week I traipsed down to the Heilig dutifully to see Barbara Stanwyck in "East Side, West Side," and got in on a preview of MGM's "The Reformer and the Redhead," a comedy with Dick Powell and June Allyson.

After seeing the film, I am more convinced than ever that David Wayne, who got second billing and top laughs, is a fine comedian and actor. He's the fellow that helped Katherine Hepburn and Spencer Tracy in "Adam's Rib," and since Powell and Allyson are easier to steal scenes from, Wayne has a field day in "The Reformer and the Redhead."

The picture is about a reform candidate (Powell) running for mayor. With his sidekick (Wayne), he tries to get the backing of the corrupt political machine, since the two

are not so interested in reform as they are in getting on the gravy-train. Just as they are about to jump aboard, the redhead (Miss Allyson) comes along and catches the reform candidate's eye. As a result he misses the train but catches the miss.

Involved are also a number of animals, including a tame lion, Herman, and a wild lion, Caesar. However, even with these two, Wayne still steals the show.

In fact his only real competition in getting laughs comes from a fellow whose name I remember as Melvin Kaplan. Kaplan, who plays Leon, a \$25 a week flunky for lawyers Wayne and Powell, is at his best when he asks for a \$10 a week raise from Wayne, whose only answer is a no dressed in legal

(Please turn to page three)