

Oregon Daily EMERALD

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published five days a week during the school year except examination and vacation periods, 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 a term.
Opinions expressed on the editorial pages are those of the writer and do not pretend to represent the opinions of the ASUO or of the University. Unsigned editorials are written by the editor; initiated editorials by the associate editors.

Neuberger, Our Choice

Next Tuesday Oregon voters will go to the polls to participate in that biennial phenomenon—a national election. The Oregon election this year is of unusual interest, because the voters have a real choice to make in the election of a United States senator.

The state's ingrown Republicanism has offered the voter very little to choose from in past years. The Democrats, until this year, have failed to nominate anyone who could be considered a serious contender. The Republican incumbent has usually won, merely because he was the incumbent.

The senatorial race this year is different. Richard L. Neuberger, the Democratic nominee, is as well known at least as his opponent, Senator Guy Cordon, Republican incumbent.

Republican tactics in past elections have been clearly aimed at election of the incumbent without dwelling to any extent on the issues at stake. We note with dismay the discouraging tendency in the Oregon Republican party to follow these same tactics in the present election.

Republicans don't say much about Cordon's record of voting for the Bricker amendment and against NATO. We are told merely that he is a Republican, admittedly a conservative Republican, and that Oregon is a Republican state, so Cordon should be re-elected. Eisenhower is a Republican and needs members of his own party to carry through his program, we are told. The fact that the president is a liberal Republican and can and has carried through his program with liberal support from both parties is conveniently glossed over by Cordon supporters.

Oregon voters have furthermore been warned by GOP partisans that the election of Neuberger would be a disgrace to the fine conservative reputation of our fair state. They have compared Neuberger with Senator Wayne Morse, (a comparison we fail to interpret as entirely derogatory) saying Oregon could not survive such a combination in the US Senate.

Wayne Morse is not up for re-election this year. Outside of the fact he is campaigning for Neuberger, he is not an issue in this campaign. Neuberger should be judged on his own merits, not on the basis of a comparison with our junior senator.

Is Neuberger really too radical to represent Oregon? We think not. However, we do not fully endorse all of his actions and ideas. He does come closer to our concepts of progressive, liberal government than his conservative opponent.

Voters actually should not have too difficult a time in making up their minds about the senatorial election. Liberals of both parties, tired of an immovable Oregon delegation to Congress will vote for Neuberger; conservatives of both parties, afraid of any change, can be expected to vote for the retention of Cordon as senator.

The choice can be as simple as this. We think Oregon needs a change, which can be brought about by the election of Richard L. Neuberger to the US Senate.

Survey of Lit



"Are you reading ahead in the assignment again?"

Letters to the Editor

The Case Closes

Emerald Editor:

I had no intention of entering into the nonsense about my morals, planning to let it die a natural death like other university gossip; however, the editorial comments on Mr. McCarroll's letter were just a little too much to take in a prone position. Mr. Gardner has for some reason chosen to avoid "Just the Facts" and has printed a good deal of incorrect information (gossip) about the Jensen Case. I feel a little like Dreyfus. This letter is my side of the story which previously has been neglected.

I petitioned for the job of assembly director because it is something that I have been very interested in doing since entering the University. I think it is a fine way to spread good will to the high schools and other colleges, when properly handled. That was my only reason for petitioning. I have no interest in politics on the campus and if I had known the position was a political one I would never have petitioned. I wanted to present a good show—this is the sole intent of the performer. I was appointed to this position, much to my pleasure, by a vote of 14 to 3.

The following week I set about putting a show together. It was to be, as I had promised the senate at my interview, a show with no vulgarity. I was pleased with the talent that was showing interest in the production and becoming even more enthused as things began to take shape. On Wednesday, a week after my appointment, Mr. Summers stopped me on campus and said he would like to talk to me some time during the day. I agreed. When I met him later in the day he informed me that some of the senators had questioned my right to the position on the grounds of previous performances on campus. I was, to say the least, taken aback. Summers further stated that it had been suggested he ask for my resignation, but he was not going to do that. He requested that I appear before the senate and clear myself of the charges. I thanked him for the opportunity to do this, being a little numbed by it all.

The charges made against me were: (1) The fact that I was not to be allowed as a Master of Ceremonies at campus functions and (2) In a takeoff on the pas de deux from Swan Lake, that Phil Lewis and I have done, there is a piece of business where Lewis grabs my chest and then runs downstage and informs the audience I am wearing falsies. This dance was performed at the Frosh assembly this fall. I explained to the senate when I appeared before them on that fateful Thursday night that the reason for the first charge was that I was just a very bad M. C. This is something that I have been aware of since my sophomore year in high school and have only taken M. C. jobs when begged to do so and in a weak moment said "yes." I can say with a clear conscience that I have never told off-color jokes when acting as an M. C. The second charge was quite true and I do not consider it immoral, vulgar, obscene, or any of those other lovely terms. I felt I was performing before an adult audience and the act was not out of place. I could never have done this for a high school audience.

Mr. Gardner, in his discussion of the case, made it seem as though I charged forth, sword in hand, into the senate meeting and proceeded to assault each senator. I was requested to appear. Why did I resign at this meeting? First, because I had given my word to the senate, in a gentleman's agreement, that there would be no vulgarity in the show.

They were to have a chance to view the production before anyone else saw it and at that time make their corrections. I have been raised to believe that a person's word is a binding thing. I had given my word and if that was not good enough for the ASUO they should find someone that they are able to trust. My second reason was that I was sure this would only be the first of many appearances I would have to make before the senate to explain my every move. Thirdly, a committee was organized to control me without my knowledge. I agreed with the plan drawn up, but would like to know about these things as I had some ideas on the subject. Fourth and foremost, the charge against me were so very childish and labored that it was evident that someone wanted me out of the position very badly and if it meant that much for a student body officer to impress his will on others, I will not spoil his fun.

After I resigned from the position I discovered the following very interesting facts. On the Tuesday after my appointment Mark Tapscot, the other petitioner who had been promised the job by Summers, received a phone call from a senator telling him that he could have the position as they had found sufficient evidence with which to "hang" me. Also it was told me that during my first interview with the senate Mr. Summers mimicked my gestures and made a large point of the time limit on the interview. He did neither of these things during Mr. Tapscot's interview.

On the evening of my resignation an Emerald reporter, in search of a scoop, cornered me and took down all this information plus information from Mr. Tapscot. This same reporter was all "fired up" to have the story of the year. This story was lost somewhere in the Theta Chi house.

I would like to ask just two questions. Why is all of this fuss being made over so trivial a matter as my resignation? Who started the "get Jensen campaign"? Perhaps Mr. DuShane could give us some answers.

Please let this be the end of the Jensen case. Far too much time and space have been wasted on it now. The world is far too busy a place to spend time on Jensen cases. I do not mind being a space filler, but I am sure there are better things to write about. Thank you very much for all of the ink and paper and for spelling my name correctly so many times, but as far as the Jensen case is concerned, let this be THE END.

Oregon's Bad Boy
John T. Jensen

Convincing Evidence

Emerald Editor:

The attack on Mr. McCarroll in Monday's Emerald offers convincing evidence that the editor considers "common standards of good taste" to be quite low.

It also offered the campus proof of Mr. McCarroll's contention that "a person of little imagination but a great deal of zeal, could exaggerate the importance of minor things." Because he wrote a letter expressing dissent from the policies of the editor in the Jensen case, he was subjected to the accusations that he was fired as Emerald drama critic because he had violated the Emerald's standards of good taste, and incidentally because he was a bad speller. The editor also insinuated—sincerely, since he doubtless believes that no one could rationally disagree with him—that Mr. McCarroll wrote his letter merely to anger the editor.

The editor said of Mr. McCarroll: "If his intention was to anger us, we must disappoint him." In all probability, Mr. McCarroll is disappointed

—not because his letter failed to anger the editor, but rather because it did anger the editor. Many others are disappointed also.

A great many students are getting tired of the editor's highly personalized and emotional approach to matters which should be dealt with in an objective manner. They are tired of the constant reference to Senator Morse as the man who holds the Senate record for talking the longest, and they resent you headlining him as the "Talkathon Champ." It is a great misfortune that Emerald policies are presented in such a manner while at the same time we have on campus a fine journalism school which is training many men and women to seek the real issues of controversy and report them factually and objectively. And I am sure that in the journalism school the editor would learn that, even on the editorial page, there is an obligation to stick to the real issue.

I am sure that the editor's distaste for Senator Morse is not rooted in the fact that Senator Morse has broken the senate record for continuous speaking. I am sure that the editor's emotional response to Mr. McCarroll's letter was not provoked by Mr. McCarroll's misspelled words or his "past" as a drama critic. The editor is entitled to his likes and dislikes, but they would be both more persuasive and palatable if they were presented clearly and fairly.

Very Sincerely,
William T. Linklater

All Campus Vote

Emerald Editor:

It has come to the attention of the writers that Betty Coed and Joe College could have been more aptly named Joe Whiskers and Betty Whiskerino.

We are not concerned with the results of the contest, merely the means by which the results were determined. The fact that only those attending the 1954 Whiskerino were allowed to vote constitutes a cross-section—not of the University of Oregon—but of the students attending the 1954 Whiskerino. Secondly, the ultimatum that students must be present before 9:30 in order to vote presents some problems. It is highly improbable that everyone will be there by 9:30, especially girls whose dates call for them at 10:00 or later. Another thought that occurs here is this: what about the girls who didn't have dates to call for them. And the other students who didn't want to attend the Whiskerino, but did want to vote.

If the students favored an all campus vote it would eliminate these difficulties, and also indicate that only students of Oregon would vote. This is not to imply that we dislike the San Jose State delegates, among others, yet, can we justifiably admit the votes of other schools in our campus contests.

In the opinion of the writers—who were at the dance, did vote, and are not attempting to be hypocritical—this topic is important. It is important not only this year, but in the future, not only concerning this contest, but others that are so held.

Thus we advocate the all campus vote in campus contests, so that the decision in the future will represent the many and not the few.

Merry Christmas,
Sally Cummins
Pat Beard

Today's Staff

Makeup Editor—Dick Lewis.
Copy Desk—Dorothy Griffith, Sally Ryan.
News Desk—Mary Alice Allen, Jerry Harrell.
Night Staff—Kathy Morrison.