

+ EMERALD EDITORIALS +

Clarification Needed

The violators have been punished, Oregon State will get its football turf replaced, the papers have had their college "prank" story and the discipline committee supposedly has a precedent to hold over the heads of future vandals. But the case of the 12-foot UO doesn't seem to be closed yet.

What remains is a need for clarification of the actual inter-campus agreements which were so controversial in last week's turf burning and dissemination of this information to those most concerned—the students themselves.

The press quoted Dan Poling, Oregon State's dean of men, that the six vandals would be expelled from Oregon under the terms of an agreement between the two schools dating back to 1947. Presidents A. L. Strand of Oregon State and Harry Newburn of Oregon made a verbal pact in 1945 which was formalized in 1947 by the discipline committee. The question comes in the application of the agreement to the early-season incident.

Poling interpreted it as applying in any case, not just in connection with the annual Oregon-Oregon State game. It had been thought at first by Oregon officials that the inter-campus agreement covered only the single game activity, but a check of the records of the discipline committee revealed the full-season coverage implication. At any rate, suspension, not expulsion, is the provision for punishment in the Oregon end of the agreement, which comes under article five of the student discipline code.

This "blanket" article decrees suspension for any student "engaged in malicious activity on a foreign campus." Thus the discipline committee and the Deans of Men and Women have power to punish offenders for a multitude of crimes.

One problem is to define the terms of the reciprocal agreement so that definitions and punishments of crimes will be the same on both campuses. The other is to inform students of the consequences resulting from such activity. The case of the six arsonists is an unfortunate method for doing this, but it has served the purpose somewhat.

The publication of the Student Code in today's Emerald should aid the purpose further, if it is read.—(C.M.)

A Brighter Future

Things are looking up for the college graduate. Not too long ago, the graduate had to be satisfied with the knowledge that he had accumulated a well-rounded education, whether or not he had obtained a well-paid job. The average laborer made more than his educated brother.

Today's average laborer earns approximately \$3900 for a 40-hour week. The average new graduate receives approximately \$4200 for the same work week. Salaries of \$235 to \$525 are expected by most graduates, according to a recent survey in the U.S. News and World Report.

The figures are not, of course, wholly accurate, nor do they represent the whole picture. Just what the student has accumulated in the four years he spent before obtaining his degree must be considered, for merely being a graduate means little. In addition to the tricks he needs to know to pick up that extra \$300 a year, the graduate should have a well-rounded background which will enable him to make better use of his position.

This means that during his undergraduate career, the student should accumulate as wide a cultural background as possible, at the same time including sufficient technical training to enable him to qualify for the kind of a job he wishes to obtain. Obviously it is to his benefit to decide early in his career what he wishes to do so that he may choose subjects which will be most beneficial to him in his later life.

With this in mind, he has a brighter future to look forward to.—(S.R.)

Footnotes

We were most concerned about the safety of the faculty members in the procession for Charter day as they marched from their seats in McArthur court. A curled up edge of the rug, which covered the basketball court tripped almost every robed pedagogue as he walked out.

Letters to the Editor

Emerald Editor:

It seems to me that the student body is being cheated!

I just had the opportunity to read over the minutes of the ASUO Senate for this year. I did not realize, until now, that our student government was working so effectively and taking such complete charge and interest in our campus activities as well as our governmental problems. Not everyone has had the opportunity to read these minutes, but they could if the Emerald would only take some of its space to print them. Perhaps then when election time rolled around, the students would know what their Senate is doing and why it is so essential to have good officers.

Is it not feasible that this could be done? We really should know what is going on and what better place to find out than in the newspaper that was meant for students.

Jane Flippo
Senior in Education

Emerald Editor:

The members of Phi Gamma Delta feel an obligation to their alums, the University, and to ourselves to write an explanation of the function that the Eugene Register-Guard so inappropriately termed a "celebration that got out of hand" in last Thursday's paper.

The purpose of the function,

which is not uncommon to fraternities, was to give the underclass, (the new men in the house) an opportunity to take a break from their rigid study rules and house details. The affair was a house tradition between the members of the upperclass and underclass, with each class trying to outwit the other and in turn, to impose limited punishment upon the defeated class. In this case a cold shower was the punishment. This will explain the presence of "nude men" in the hallway.

There was no property damage to the house and no one was injured in the fracas. The noise and supposed damage was confined to the limits of the house and the yard proper.

When the police arrived, the "celebration" had already been quelled and most of the members were in bed.

The one and only thing this fraternity feels responsibility to apologize for is the noise and discomfort we caused our neighbors.

Members of
Phi Gamma Delta

P.S.: Bill Stoner is not Fiji house-president.

Emerald Editor:

The editorial "An Evil Force," which appeared in Tuesday's (Oct. 18, 1955) Emerald says, in the defense of the Greek sys-

tem: "As for race, on this campus the question has not come up because of the small number of 'Non-Caucasians' on campus and the fact that those few, for reasons of their own, have not chosen to rush."

Of course the Greek system is not an evil force on campus—it has many merits, but, we disagree with S. R.'s statement that the question of race has never come up. Just because Non-Caucasians are a minority group does not mean that they do not exist. Just how many "Non-Caucasians" do we have to have at the University of Oregon before they are worthy of consideration? We have a problem as long as there is one person on campus who is excluded by written or unwritten laws from any organization, because of his race.

Yes, one fraternity does pledge members of other races; but there are nearly forty Greek organizations on the Oregon campus. Perhaps the fact that there are so few Non-Caucasians in Greek houses is what keeps so many of our students of other races from rushing. After all, why should one pay a five dollar rushing fee for what looks like a hopeless cause?

Marilyn Purkey
Nancy Stone
Mary Cadiz

Soap Box Orator



"BE CAREFUL WHAT YOU SAY TO FRED—HE'S A POLITICAL SCIENCE MAJOR."

INTERPRETING THE NEWS

Pentagon Report, Reply Leave Us as We Were

By J. M. Roberts
Of the Associated Press

The Pentagon report and General MacArthur's reply leave us just where we were with regard to Russian participation in the Japanese war and the price paid for it by the Allies.

The fact is that Roosevelt and Churchill acted on military advice in trying to get Russia into the war. The price they paid, in territory that wasn't theirs and concessions of Chinese rights without consulting China, can be argued about all night.

The military reports and MacArthur's statements do indicate that many believed Russia would enter and take what she wanted regardless of the concessions, and that if the Allied leaders were giving away something they didn't own, they also were merely giving away something Russia was going to have anyway.

The implication, by omission of some of the facts, that Russia entered only at the last moment to seize unearned benefits after failing to relay Japan's surrender feelers to the Allies, is a distortion.

Russia, for her own reasons, didn't relay news of the Japanese feelers, and it is quite possible she didn't want peace before she could get to the front. But she did enter the Far Eastern war three months after the German surrender, as she had agreed.

The main failure of the Allied leaders was in ignoring the fact that the things for which Russia asked their approval were part of a formula,

made blatantly public over a long period of years, for Communist conquest of all Asia.

As for the political gambits of the MacArthur-Democratic dispute over pre-Yalta and post-Yalta details, neither side seems to have made much hay. MacArthur still says he favored Russian participation immediately after Pearl Harbor, cooled off on it by 1944 when things were going to suit him in his own war, and was merely pursuing the Yalta verdict in his references to Russian entry thereafter.

The Pentagon report doesn't show that he was asked or gave his advice directly in connection with Yalta, as the Democrats implied, and he says he wasn't and didn't.

As for what he might have said had he been asked, we have his word that he didn't want Russia then, and you can't go behind that. The record shows other military leaders were warming up and then cooling off about Russian participation from time to time, too.

Hindsight frequently interferes with what historians select as the most pertinent part of a given record, as well as with personal recollections of attitudes at given times. That makes humans, but no liars, out of those involved.

All we can be sure of is that if Russia had done what she was going to do anyway, without Allied approval if necessary, the world would have had notice, a year or so before it did, of what it should have known all the time about her postwar intentions.



The Oregon Daily Emerald is published five days a week during the school year, except during 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 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 the University. Unsigned editorials are written by the editor; initialed editorials by members of the editorial board.

GORDON RICE, Editor DONNA RUNBERG, Business Manager
SALLY RYAN, Editorial Page Editor JACK RADICH, Advertising Manager
JERRY CLAUSSEN, ANNE HILL, BOB ROBINSON, Associate Editors

SAM VAHEY, Managing Editor
ANNE RITCHIE, News Editor JOAN RAINVILLE, Asst. Advertising Mgr.
CHUCK MITCHELMORE, Sports Editor NANCY SHAW, Office Manager

EDITORIAL BOARD: Gordon Rice, Jerry Claussen, Anne Hill, Chuck Mitchelmore, Anne Ritchie, Bob Robinson, Sally Ryan, Sam Vahey

Asst. Managing Editor: Valerie Hersh
Asst. News Editors: Bill Mainwaring, Marcia Mauney, Loretta Meyer, Cornelia Fogle
Feature Editor: Carol Craig
Nat'l Adv. Mgr.: Laura Morris
Classified Adv. Mgr.: Pat Cushman
Asst. Office Mgr.: Becky Towler
Circulation Mgr.: Ken Klanecky
Executive Secretary: Shirley Parmenter