Saturday's Hero

"Say, Ed, notice how hard ole Worthal is hittin' their center?"

Is Just Getting Out the Vote Enough?

We have been hearing a great deal about the citizen's duty to vote during the past few weeks, as several civic and business organizations throughout the country have engaged in an effort to get out the vote in November.

Full page ads sponsored by an insurance corporation in national magazines show the comparative voting statistics of the United States and several other countries. Only 51 per cent of the American voting public went to the polls in 1948, while such countries as Australia, Great Britain, Sweden, Western Germany, Canada and Israel have all had percentages over 70 in their most recent elections.

We have been hearing little about the citizen's duty to make sure that his vote is an informed one, however. Those supporting this drive for a larger percentage of voters completely overlook this duty. Apparently they feel that the stature of democracy increases in direct proportion to the number of people who vote.

It is implied that those who do not vote are unpatriotic. But patriotism does not mean voting for Eisenhower because Stevenson is a divorced man, or voting for Stevenson because Eisenhower made a poor impression on television. More important—voting should indicate a responsible and definite opinion—an opinion based on the voter's interpretation of the issues in the campaign and the stand which the candidates have made on them.

An indiscriminate "get out the vote" campaign will not advance democracy one foot. In fact, many who vote regularly might better stay home Nov. 4. Southerners who vote against the GOP of the 1860's and 70's rather than vote for the Democrats of 1952, and mid-Westerners who vote against all Democrats "because they brought us into two World Wars" will do little to make the nation's choice in November an intelligent one.—Cornell Daily Sun.

Oregon Daily EMERALD

The OREGON DAILY EMERALD published Tuesday through Friday during the college year except Sept. 17 and 19; Nov. 27 through Dec. 1; Dec. 4, 9 and 10; Dec. 12 through Jan. 5; March 5, 10 and 11; Mar. 13 through Mar. 30; and May 30 through June 4, with issues on Nov. 8, Feb. 7 and May 9 by the Student Publications Board 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 editorial staff members. Unsigned editorials are written by the editor.

LARRY HOBART, Editor JIM SHEA, Business Manager

HELEN JONES, BILL GURNEY, Associate Editors

JIM HAYCOX, Editorial Assistant

AL KARR, Managing Editor

The Oregon Daily Emerald welcomes letters to the editor. Letters should be not longer than 400 words and signed by the author or authors. Requests that names be withheld will be given careful consideration. Letters may be mailed to the Emerald editor or left in the Emerald quonset adjacent to the Journalism building. Letters will be printed at the discretion of the editor unless noted that the letter is not for publication.

MORE AND MORE PRESSURE ....

West Europe Courts Neutralism

By E. A. Van Natta
Emerald International Affairs Analyst

Although government plans of rearmament are going ahead rather satisfactorily in Western Europe there continues to exist a large number of people in the respective countries who have not as yet been convinced that such plans are the best means by which to insure European peace and security.

To the vast majority of those who disagree with rearmament some form of neutrality offers the old salvation to a Europe caught in the struggle between the United States and the Soviet Union. Regardless of how illogical such reasoning might seem to an American the fact remains that the advocates of European neutrality have built up quite a case for it and are exerting more and more pressure on the governments involved in rearmament.

France Representative

France can serve as a representative example of a country in which this force is at work. Prior to 1949 and the North Atlantic Alliance there was little neutralistic talk among the French. The general feeling was that a healthy internal economy bolstered with Marshall Plan aid would prove sufficient in the fight against Communism, both internally and externally.

But in 1949 plans of a military alliance were added to the anti-Communism campaign and to many Frenchmen compliance with such an idea was considered both unnecessary and impossible. It was at this time that the first signs of neutralism made their appearance.

Left and Right

In keeping with the times the French advocates of a neutral Europe can be classified either to the Left or to the Right but even so, their basic tenets differ very little and both groups are predominantly anti-Communist. On the conservative side of the political fence are such men as Hubert Beuve-Mery, editor of the conservative newspaper Le Monde, and Etienne Gilson, member of the French Academy and moderate Catholic scholar. Leader of the more leftist group is Claude Bourdet, former Resistance journalist and editor of the Catholic left-wing magazine, L'Observateur.

In spite of their different political leanings as concerns internal French affairs both groups are in agreement that:

Points of Agreement

1. Co-existence is still possible between the two clashing ideologies and every chance should be taken to reconcile the two through international meetings.
2. The North Atlantic Alliance should be scrapped since it can offer little in the way of real security and furthermore that it can only provoke distrust and fear in the Soviet Union.
3. Rearmament on a large international scale must not take place because it can only lead to an aggravation of poor internal social and economic conditions and hence open the door to more Communist infiltration among the working masses.
4. Defense of Western Europe should be patterned after the Swiss or Swedish plan of armed neutrality. Each nation would look after its own defense—a defense sufficient only to guarantee security from an outside force.
5. Western Germany should not be rearmed, at least until her former victims have sufficient proof that her military potential will not be used against them.

Economic and Military Aid

For the conservative neutralists U. S. economic aid should continue but all military aid should cease. The more leftist neutrals would prefer that the French give up the battle in Indo-China and concentrate on economic and social conditions at home. Their contention is that in stopping "Operation Waste" in the Far East they could very well solve their economic ills in France without further U. S. aid of any sort.

There is little need for arguing the pros and cons of the neutralist position because success or failure of the plan will have little bearing on the future fate of Western Europe. Even if Western Europe should decide to follow a neutral policy between the United States and the Soviet Union in the present emergency she would almost automatically become a battlefield in the event of a military showdown between the East and West.

Common Denominator

The common denominator of all neutralist thought is survival but unfortunately for France and the rest of Western Europe survival today depends not upon what policies they do or do not follow but rather upon the ups and downs of American-Soviet relations in the present struggle for power.

Francois Mauriac summed up rather neatly neutralist psychology in a recent article in Figaro when he wrote:

"The tragedy of all is to live in a disillusioned country. In four years France has passed from the rank of a great nation to that of an assisted nation; why deny it when it is a fact? Neutralism is nothing more than a hankering for the kind of autonomy that has been condemned by the facts of our present situation. In their childish rage the neutralists kick the table."

Baseball Blasted By Russian Press

By Jim Haycox
Emerald Editorial Assistant

We were noticing not so very long ago that those keen, analytical Russian journalists have just finished scoring another first on us. This time the revelation came about baseball, once believed to be our national pastime.

The Red press quickly cut through the fog and deception of western news writing, pointing out that since the dawn of history (which came about 1918, they say) Russian peasants have been gathering on the salt lots of Siberia playing something, which by official Russian description, sounds like a cross between brass-knuckles soccer and kick-the-can.

The meat of this latest exposee carried a well-timed blast at the way we've changed the old ball game. Today, the harange went baseball players live in chains, eat stale bread and day-old water and drop like flies from over exertion. In fact (and we knew this anyway) they're paid so little that few are able to scrape up bus fare at the end of the season and go back to the sugar cane fields for the winter (cleverly disguised by the press as the Cuban League). We'll certainly have to agree with them there—$86,000 just isn't what it used to be.

But, as we were about to say, we'd just finished digesting the word from Moscow when we took a glance at our own paper. My goodness, what a shock it was. 'Bums' and Yanks Start War Today, Huskies Invade Portland, Yanks Smash Dodgers, Ducks Invade Empireland. See what we mean. No wonder those poor Russians got so worked up.

What is the effect of Communism in Japan? What do the recent elections indicate? How is Japan's economy faring?

Yasuo Kurata, recently with the United Press and now enrolled at the University of Oregon, will answer these questions in a series of two articles beginning Wednesday.

'Rock Wagram': A Bad Saroyan

By Michael Lundy

William Saroyan, master of sentimentality, has a new (1951) novel out called "Rock Wagram" which is reprinted by Signet Books. Saroyan as usual has dipped into his great, throbbing, warm Armenian heart to prove that despite all, life is good, life is rich, life is full. It gets awfully sticky.

Rock Wagram is the screen name of Arak Vagramian, an Armenian bartender who becomes a famous movie star, but who is not turned from what he feels is the purpose of his life—to love his wife and raise children. Unfortunately, Ann, the woman he chooses to bestow his great love on, is an inveterate liar and cheat, and has other ideas about love.

Cunning Interpretation

The narrative is cunningly interrupted about every other page by several paragraphs of the author's parenthesized rambling.

The sum of all these asides, about half of which are intentional gibberish, is that a man is meaningless but he has a hell of a lot of things he must do before he dies. In other words Saroyan has worked this into the narrative stream, but he apparently became lazy in "Rock Wagram."

Starts Well

The story starts out extremely well. Rock is introduced by good third person description, and his character and charm is established by the simply told surface actions. The reader is allowed to do a little of his own work in delineating the personality of a man by observing the reactions of others to him. This is always flattering to a reader, if well done. Paul Key, the movie magnate who discovers and fosters Rock, is also cleverly depicted in the same manner. To a lesser degree, all of the male characters are convincingly portrayed.

It is in the woman of the story that Saroyan bogs down. Ann, Rock's wife, is practically never seen and her personality is unknown except as Rock feels about her. Thus, when she leaves him and his life becomes supposedly meaningless, it is impossible to feel the tragedy that is obviously intended.

A Saccharine Taste

More time is spent on Rock's mother, who speaks only Armenian and who is desperately trying to hold together the old clannish family ties. She is depicted as a woman who has had great personal misfortune with the death of her husband and breaking up of her family, but still is brave, great hearted, and infinitely wise. She leaves us with a saccharine taste in the mouth, as do all of the book's family scenes. Saroyan seems incapable of writing about Armenians without sentimentality.

Saroyan functions principally as an observer of the human scene. "Rock Wagram" is not even good observation. When Saroyan is good, as in "My Name is Aram" and "The Time of Your Life," he is very, very good. But when he is bad, he is lousy.