Oregon Daily

The Orgon Dally EmeralD is published Feb 4 thru 8, 11 thru 15, 18 thru 22, 25 thru 29, March 10, Apr 2 thru 4, 7 thru 11, 14 thru 18, 21 thru 25, 28 thru May 2, May 6 thru 10, 12 thru 16, 19 thru 22, and May 26 by the Associated Students of the University of Oregon. Entered as second class matter at the post office, Eugene, Oregon. Subscription rates: \$5 per school year, \$2 per term.

Opinions expressed on the editorial page are those of the writer and do not pretend to represent the opinions of the ASUO or of the University. Initialed editorials are written by the associate editors. Unsigned editorials are written by the editor.

Unexpected Source

A desire to get away from campus politics was expressed by a couple of unexpected people the other day.

The Student Union Board has, from its inception, been extremely wary of involvement with political issues. That's why its membership selection runs through schools, not elections.

And in the beginning there was an atmosphere of mutual wariness between the board and the ASUO government, each fearing the other would try to invade its territory, and the board fearing the ASUO might try to drag it into politics.

The first fear, thus far at least, has seemed to be relatively unfounded. The second was dealt a blow Wednesday.

It seems that the SU board was discussing its policy of not allowing any sort of election campaign literature on its premises, the matter having come up when a freshman candidate littered the soda bar with leaflets.

Discussion indicated that the board deemed such practices undesirable because of the mess involved. However, board members suggested policy modifications which would give some recognition to student body elections. Suggestions included providing space for leaflets or for candidates' names and pictures.

It's not our purpose here to debate the desirability of either suggestion, both of which were discarded. Both had loopholes. We just thought the comments made against them were rather amusing by virtue of who made them.

Two board members who argued against the suggestions based their point partially on the following reasoning:

Let's keep the Student Union a sanctuary away from campus politics... For weeks before the elections all the students hear about is polities and campaigning . . . let's have one place where they can get away from it.

The advocates of this point of view? ASUO President Bill Carry and Vice-President Merv Hampton.-G. G.

The Atomic Age-

Reader's Criticisms Bring Reply On Egyptian, Iranian Policies

By Phil Johnson

The thundering herd has

Opponents of certain Middle Eastern policies obviously are

"ignorant facts and irresponsible judgment." Fur thermore, the United Press and other news sources apparently should not be relied upon because they "misrepresent the real news."



Phil Johnson

These conclusions can be inferred from letters to the editor recently contributed by Ali Jassim, Aziz Abdul and Said Nehorayan. It is probable, but not quite certain, that their notes referred to the Feb. 4 column entitled, "Egypt-Iranians Discover Hate Doesn't Make Best Policy."

The column had attempted to explain that the Egyptian and Iranian anti-English moves were weakening their own chances for survival against Communism.

The Jassim-Abdul letter contained one sentence concerning the content of the column and five asserting that the columnist lacked information or education.

This policy can be employed in any discussion-talk for one minute about the question and spend five minutes asserting that your opponent knows nothing. Very effective.

Incidentally, the lone explanatory sentence was irrelevant. It stated, "Middle Eastern countries ask only for political and economic independence." The column did not deny this. It merely stated that the methods employed by the Arab people led to the developments which were highly unsatisfactory for those nations.

Nehorayan's letter attempts to minimize Iran's profits from the sale of oil to England-"We were getting practically nothing from the company." Incidentally, "practically nothing" amounted to 43 per cent of the Iranian national budget. They have badly missed that income since they expelled the English.

Nehorayan requested some knowledge about "Russia, Communism, Iran, oil situation, Suez Canal and the middle eastern countries as a whole."

Here are a few:

1. The people of Egypt live under terrible conditions of poverty, but their playboy king, according to Time magazine, once gambled away \$160,000 in one week at the Riviera. He and his crew occupied 32 rooms at the Carlton hotel at a cost of \$2000 daily.

2. Egypt requests "independence," but they also ask for control of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan with a veto power over the Sudan legislature's decisions.

3. Egypt demands freedom, but, according to Time, King Farouk's "elections are invariably rigged, the budget is hopelessly padded with graft, and income taxes are hardly ever paid."

4. When El Nahas Pasha signed the 1936 Anglo-Egyptian treaty, he hailed it as a step toward Egyptian independence. He denounced it last fall, causing the present crisis.

5. Egypt was a major participant in the first aggressive war violating the charter of the United Nations. Then they accuse England of "imperialism," which may be true, but is similar to the case of the pot calling the kettle black.

6. Last July the International Court of Justice requested maintenance of the status quo in Iran until the oil dispute could be settled by negotiation. Iran refused to abide by the request.

Finally, another contention by Nehorayan deserves clarification. After describing the unfortunate economic conditions in Iran, he writes, "Whom do you think is responsible for these? You, the ones like you, and British Government.'

This writer will immediately attempt to cease causing these conditions.

Campus Headlines . . . Stanford Gals Get

Visits from 'Stork' By Rae Thomas

Branner hall girls received a rude start one afternoon at Stanford when a large bird resembling a stork appeared on the road adjoining the building. The stork seemed to be in no hurry to leave, as he settled in the field and remained there, completely unfazed by passing cars, for the remainder of the afternoon.

Also at Stanford, it seems that the yell-leaders are lax in game attendance. Last week a fair turnout of fans showed up, the band was there, and did a good job, and the television men were there too, but the TV sport fans didn't see any yell leaders, because they didn't bother to come.

A student at the University of North Carolina was booted last week as the result of using firecrackers in the dorm. It seems that increasing use of such explosives as torpedo-type fire-crackers, "bombs, "dynamite caps," and fuse-type powders re sulted in an investigation of 'practical jokers" with the booting as an outcome-and more promised in the future, if such things should continue.

At the University of Maryland, instead of stealing doorknobs from sorority houses, thieves entered a fraternity house and escaped with 12 quarts of milk, a 15-pound ham and four frying chickens. Thirty-five dollars was the estimated loss.

The showing of "For Men Only," a movie designed to point out the evils of college fraternities, was a flop at the University of Washington. The final opinion of the campus reviewers was: "We've never wasted 90 minutes more completely."

Students who cheat have been divided into five types by Albion college in Michigan. 1. Those who cheat only in desperation; 2. Those who cheat only occasionally, and are conscience-stricken while doing so; 3. Students who cheat while not believing in it, and excuse themselves by saying the tests were unfair or they were too busy with worthy extracurricular activities; 4. Students who boast of new cheating methods they have devised; 5. Students who never cheat.

This last group includes those who feel cheating is unethical, those who can get good marks without cheating, and those who feel cheating is just too much

-- Letters to the Editor --

Big Brothers Reply

Emerald Editor: We would like to thank Mr. Anawalt for what we believe to be a sincere letter carried in the Feb. 5 issue of the Emerald, concerning the YMCA's "big brother" program. His letter corrected some misconceptions created by your story on "big brothers'

printed on the front page of the

Feb. 1 issue of the Emerald.

Mr. Anawalt's defense of the Skipworth Home was very much in order and we can only say that the Emerald's reporter misinterpreted our feelings about the home. We certainly had no intention of condemning, in any way, the home or its supervisor. Our concern was to indicate that there were areas of need at the home that a group of interested students might be able to help meet.

We mentioned that there was room for improvement of the recreation facilities because we felt that that might be a place where a group of students could contribute to the effectiveness of the home.

However, Mr. Anawalt's attack on the "big brother" movement and on our personal sincerity seems particularly unjustified. Those of us who are participating in this program, as "big brothers," are giving of our time and money in a genuine effort to be a friend to a boy who perhaps needs a friend more than anything else. We do not seek any reward for this other than the satisfaction of knowing that we are doing something worthwhile. We do have a sincere concern for the boys we are trying to help, and we think Mr. Anawalt should know that as yet no boy whom we have contacted has questioned our sincerity.

As a by-product of our efforts to help these boys we do enjoy the feeling that we have done some good for others, and we do feel that it helps us to have a more tolerant attitude toward do not always find it possible to Jerry Ohlsen

juvenile delinquents, and we do think that it is good training in getting along with people. And the reason we said these things to the reporter was to indicate that there are values in this for the "big brothers" as well as for the "little brothers" in the hope that other students would want to join with us in this worthwhile program. We were not entirely wrong on this, for already we have three new big brothers who became interested as a result of reading the Emerald article.

We hope the program will continue to grow and that it may become increasingly effective in serving the Lane County juvenile department and the youth of Lane county. If Mr. Anawalt feels that he has so much wisdom on the matter of "sincerity" and "unselfish concern" we would be happy to have him attend one of our meetings, which are held every Tuesday at 3 p.m. in 318 Student Union.

Bob Briggs Fred Wilhelm

Parking Vs. Beauty Emerald Editor:

As a frequent recipient of Jens Jensen's "citations," I feel that I am fully qualified to make criticisms of the policy of this University toward the parking problem.

As students enter this University, they are given windshield decais which are supposed to signify "student parking privileges." Actually, they very generously entitle one to park anywhere that is not already occupied by other students, faculty, or the general public. A great privilege indeed! Student parking decals serve only to help the office of student affairs in identifying violators, and contribute nothing in the way of "privileges," as their

common title so strongly implies. Those who live a considerable distance from the campus and are forced to drive in every day

arrive a half-hour early. When they find themselves in want of a parking place after touring all the likely possibilities, it is only natural that they begin to regard some of the frowned-upon parking spots (yellow line areas, such as the waste space in the SU lot) as being acceptable. This attitude is strengthened

when one enters parking lots and finds five or six "almost parking places" in each one. On one occasion, I counted 11 spaces which were just too narrow for a car, in the Student Union lot. From my warped viewpoint, it would seem that if the traffic court sees fit to fine those poor unfortunates who are the victims of other persons' careless misuse of parking areas, they should at least use the proceeds to mark places in lots, and on the street, so that no one would park in two places at once.

From a long-range point of view, I for one fall to under-stand just why the administration sees fit to destroy parking area to create beautiful landscaping. However desirable it is to have a beautiful campus, it should be borne in mind that a University is primarily an institution of learning, and its standing as such will be judged by the quality of its students, faculty, and academic facilities, and not by its superficial beauty.

I cite as example the eradication of the old Friendly lot driveway, which could have been converted into an extended parking lot capable of containing 20 or more cars. (More than the number of parking places currently used which are termed as "improper.")

As one last complaint, I would like to know who classifies these areas, and on what basis? I am referring now to the right-hand side of the new Friendly driveway, which bears no signs or yellow paint, and at which I received a ticket today.

Parking Problem



"He takes it off when we park. Worthal can't stand wearing a 1.1.1 wrinkled shirt to class."