

Let the Senate Plan the Budget

On Thursday, Oct. 9, the ASUO senate sent to its constitutional revision committee a proposal to consider the actual matter of amending the ASUO constitution so that the ASUO budget will be under senate jurisdiction.

As things stand, the senate has no constitutional power over the budget. The constitution simply provides that the president will submit an estimated budget at the start of each term, and report his actual expenditures at the end of the term. The senate is not empowered to pass on any item, or the budget as a whole.

In practice, President Pat Dignan has stated that he would consider himself bound by the wishes of the senate in budget matters. Legally, he is not so bound.

Dignan would not be opposed to a constitutional amendment which would require overall approval or disapproval of the budget by the senate. He has stated, however, that he would not be in favor of item-by-item senate control. He feels that such control would rob the budget of its flexibility.

His position here is based on the idea that it is hard to determine at the beginning of a period just how much should be spent for each item. Under the present system he is not bound by his estimates, can vary expenditures to meet needs as they arise.

A plan for senate control of the budget could be set up in several ways. The overall approval plan which Dignan favors would simply require the president to submit a new budget if any item in his first budget was disapproved by the senate. Here, the president and vice-president, who jointly make up the budget, would have more control of expenditures.

Under the item-by-item approval plan, the senate would go down the list of proposed expenditures, paring, eliminating, or approving each one separately. Unforeseen expenditures could be handled through a reserve fund included in the budget, or senate approval could be made necessary for each of them.

The success of the latter plan would greatly depend on the foresight with which it was drawn up.

Looking at both sides of the question, we think that it is more consistent with the democratic idea of government if the legislative department controls the purse strings in item by item manner. Of course, senate control would demand more good judgment and real thought by senators. It would mean more rigidity in providing appropriations, which is not a virtue.

The senate would become a more vital part of student government. Of course, student government is not big business. The total 1952-53 estimate amounts to only \$1,840.00. But there undoubtedly will come a time when Oregon's enrollment will be much greater and much larger sums will be spent. (B.G.)

Is There a Method to Faculty Madness?

Faculty members are mighty hush-hush about their new retreat.

After announcing that they had acquired a cabin near Creswell, for staff members "wishing to get away from work for a day or two, they clammed up. This in spite of the enticing last paragraph in an Emerald story which said to make reservations through Ray Hawk.

We called Dr. Hawk. His office referred us to Donald DuShane. Mr. DuShane admitted he knew about the retreat. But he sent us to Lyle Nelson. Mr. Nelson told us to call Ray Hawk.

Now we think a hide-away for weary faculty members is a fine idea. They should buy one for students, too. Say a nice, big hotel in the vicinity of San Francisco.

But why all the secrecy? Do vacationing professors want to escape the watchful scrutiny of the Oregon Mothers? Could they be plotting the overthrow of the State Board of Education? Is giving exams that exhausting?

Anyway the iron curtain they're trying to put in front of the "retreat" won't work. They already told us what we want to know.

The faculty's cabin is located at the foot of Spencer's Butte.

It will be a fine stopping-off place for spring term picnics on that hill. (H. J.)

Visual Education



"Poor Freda—You shoulda been here yesterday when he lectured on Joan of Arc."

Radio Review

Is Radio Humor Tolerable?

by Don Collin

With coffee in hand a colleague and I were discussing humor in the entertainment world. Excluding our remarks on movies I would like to present some of our thoughts about radio comedy.

Are people tolerating today's humor or are they accepting it? If it is only being tolerated, then why haven't there been some changes made?

What is today's humor? It's the same voices, same jokes, same routine, same clatter of commercials (people can tear cigarette seams rather than smoke them) and for the listener's convenience—the same time and station.

Today's radio humor is being accepted and the reason is that a change is neither absorbed by the public nor bought by a sponsor. The acceptance is shown at the store counters all over America. Advertising is the sponsor's way of getting American people to the counter. The problem faced then is to get people to listen to commercials.

Big Names Lure

The best way to lure the listener is with a big name.

This represents a large investment and a return must be realized. So with these liabilities on the hook, the nets are out peddling them to sponsors. Sponsors are buying names because their competitors have bought big names too.

One of the refreshing programs this summer was CBS' young humorist Steve Allen who had a leisurely program with New York entertainers and songwriters as guests and mixed in repartees with the audience. Allen sustained (no sponsor) through the summer until the money boys came back for a 39-week stay.

One of the short lived newcomers was Henry Morgan, who lost his sustainer after going through a couple or three sponsors.

There are others—Fred Allen (unfortunately ill now), Lum & Abner, and Amos & Andy, before they sold themselves into half-hour-a-week shows.

Morgan, Allen Liked

These people had great comedy shows. Morgan was definitely ahead of his time. Fred Allen probably was an all-time great. He produced comedy under conditions which have ruined most—a format and a studio audience.

A format usually degenerates a program into a rut. An audience is often used to suggest to the listeners that there is something funny because the audience is laughing.

Maybe some other slants on the questions asked above will be heard early next December when one of the great comedians, Groucho Marx, speaks on "Humor in The 20th Century."

Notes to the Editor From Japan

Dear Emerald Reader:

Three months have passed since I arrived in Yokohama. Reading my diary, I can recall the days of last fall. Indeed, one year in Eugene has been one of the most unforgettable periods in my life.

Let me take this opportunity to express my heart-felt thanks to all the people on and around the campus. A student of UO last year is now teaching high school kids again over here.

You are going to have a great Presidential election this coming November. I can't say which will win. Whoever may be the next President, however, he should not neglect Asia, especially Japan.

Nelson and Sugura, whom I had seen at the Howe Field last spring, came to play baseball in the major cities throughout Japan. I was very sorry that I couldn't see them. Dr. Baldinger and Dr. Dull must have come to study over here, and I'll try to see them before they leave.

The other day I got a letter from a Hiroshima University student. I taught him five years ago and he's going to graduate next March and take a teaching job. If anyone of you are interested in him or in the city of Hiroshima—A-bombed city—would you write him directly. He wants pen pals in the U. S.

The rainy season, which I don't miss at all, will begin soon, and you will have mid-terms, too. But I do hope that you young Americans will do your best for the peaceful world, I'll do my part over here.

Sincerely,
Keiji Miyosho

The Hiroshima University student is: Shigetoshi Takashi; Junpuryo, Hirodai, Sendamachi, Hiroshima City, Japan.

Hardwicke Best

Splashy Advances Can't Exaggerate Drama Quartette

By Michael Lundy

Since it is our dual function in this column to review both books and plays, we sneaked off to Portland Saturday night and saw the First Drama Quartet read "Don Juan in Hell." It was one of the most rewarding evenings we have ever spent, even without Charles Laughton, and those of you who missed it should regret it for the rest of your lives.

The First Drama Quartet is normally composed of Charles Laughton as the Devil, Charles Boyer as Don Juan, Cedric Hardwicke as the Statue, and Agnes Moorehead as Dona Anna. For this engagement, Vincent Price played the Devil because of Laughton's movie commitments.

"Don Juan" from Shaw

"Don Juan in Hell" is the seldom done dream sequence from George Bernard Shaw's "Man and Superman." More of a philosophical entity in conversational form than a fragment from a play, it is about two and a half hours long and almost impossible to stage, especially as part of the whole play. Accordingly, the actors dress in evenings clothes and stand at four microphones with scripts on stands beside them.

Contrary to expectation, this did nothing to detract from character, action, or plausibility. The movements and positions of each actor were perfectly coordinated in relation to the others, so the tableau was always in balance. Even the turning of the pages of script was done individually and in harmony with the total effect. And we detected no one ever referring to his lines, either.

Of the four actors, Boyer had the most to say, and he said it very well indeed, although we must give Cedric Hardwicke credit for the finest performance. Boyer seemed to be listening to himself a great deal of the time, and it seems strange that after all these years in Hollywood, his accent should still be thick enough to cut.

He has a distracting habit, also of pausing between the syllables of a word, but after one became accustomed to translating as he spoke, his performance was very enjoyable. He is a much better actor than his movies show.

Hardwicke Humorous

Hardwicke seasoned the show considerably by interspersing Don Juan's and the Devil's philosophy with humor.

Agnes Moorehead gave a capable performance as Dona Anna, the eternal everywoman. Vincent Price did creditably as the Devil, although his voice got to sounding like a spoon beating inside a tin can during some of the long speeches, and Laughton's cuteness looked a little strained on him at times.

Shaw is amazingly modern and perceptive in this play, which was written in 1903. His writing forestalls criticism by the simple method of bringing up every conceivable objection and side of an issue, and leaving the hearer to pick out his own best path. Shaw is a lover of the apparent paradox.

Hell is pictured as a place people go by choice, a damnation of art, beauty, and good conversation. Heaven, on the other hand is a place of hard work and contemplation, the choice and refuge of Don Juan, the superman. Shaw is undoubtedly the greatest modern moralist.



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