

+ EMERALD EDITORIALS +

Papers and Parroting

College newspapers in three large American universities today are fighting for their integrity against the forces of censorship and control of the press. The freedom of these three newspapers is of as much importance to the student at the University of Oregon as it is to the staff members of the papers involved.

The papers at the University of Texas, the South's largest university; Louisiana State university, and the University of North Carolina are all involved in battles to protect their freedom from those who would dictate editorial policy.

Perhaps the most shocking element in this fight is that two of the papers are fighting not suppression by the university administration, but rather suppression by other students. Shocking, but perhaps not surprising—when one considers that college students readily adopt themselves to the trends of the world around them.

At North Carolina, the co-editors of the Daily Tar Heel are facing a recall election after a petition to that effect was circulated on the campus. One of the students behind the petition has accused the editors of grossly misrepresenting the overall views of the student body. Defenders of the paper charge that the student body president and his attorney general are attempting to gain control of the paper.

At Louisiana State, student politicians are interfering in every facet of the work of the Daily Reveille. The student senate voted to censure the paper for not devoting enough space to certain activities, such as the Agriculture convocation.

These so-called student leaders have attempted to dictate not only what goes into the paper, but how long the story is, how it is written, and where it goes in the paper.

At Texas the situation is somewhat different, but is still suppression in its baldest form. That university has a faculty editorial director, whose job it is to review all editorials before they appear. In spite of this, the Daily Texas says, the paper has traditionally remained free from interference.

Now, however, the Board of Regents of the University of Texas has moved to abolish the Daily Texan's right to comment on state issues. Among the items the Texan censors have refused to approve were an editorial from the New York Times, one of the country's most respected papers, and several paragraphs on press freedom by Thomas Jefferson, submitted as a student column.

The issues and charges against all three papers are generally the same. The most frequently heard complaint is that the editorials do not reflect the view of the students.

May this complaint always hold true for the press of America! The duty of the editorial page is to stimulate the minds of its readers, not to follow slavishly along behind the majority, parroting their opinions.

It is the function of the university to teach students to think for themselves, to be critical, and to continue the search for improvement in society.

Take away the right of the student to think and to criticize, and the university has no reason left for its existence. The college newspaper has the right and the responsibility to fill the roll of commentator and critic of the students, the university, the state and the nation.

The editorial page of the college newspaper is no more bound to present both sides of a controversial issue that is that of a large metropolitan daily. The editorial page is frankly the opinion section of the paper; it purports to be nothing more than that.

Removal of the right to criticize in one of these areas—state politics, for example—soon leads to loss of rights in other areas.

Carl Burgen, the managing editor of the Texan, has summed it up. He says "There can be no compromise of principle. I firmly believe that a newspaper is free or it isn't; there is no middle ground."

It is to the everlasting credit of the editors and staffs of these three papers that they have fought any infringement on their constitutional freedom. Those who would defend freedom of the press must speak out at these three great universities. They may speak proudly in the knowledge that they are on the same side with Willie Morris and Carl Burgen at Texas, Lynn Garrett at L. S. U., and Louis Kraar and Ed Yoder at UNC.

Round Two

It's round two of a familiar battle—The General vs. The President. The Truman-MacArthur feud has erupted again through the graces of Life magazine.

The latest installment contains a pointed reference to that day of April 9, 1951, when Gen. Douglas MacArthur was relieved of his command in the Far East by the then President, Harry S. Truman. The magazine gave the General a chance to reply, and he did—in 5,000 well-chosen words.

It became apparent that Truman had good reason for his action. The General had expressly disobeyed the orders of his commander-in-chief, which cannot be tolerated in any military organization.

Truman had issued an order on Dec. 6, 1950, that no public statements relating to policy matters were to be released without clearance from the department of defense. And yet on two occasions after that the General violated that order.

On March 24 he stated that he was ready to meet with the enemy commander to find a way to end the Korean war. Then on April 5 he complained about diplomats fighting a war with words.

The General made no attempt in his reply to deny that he disobeyed orders. Instead, he evaded the issue by charging that he was dismissed because he was about to expose a spy ring, which would have embarrassed the administration.

It is often difficult for a military commander to take orders from his civilian chief, who is far removed from the battle. But in a democracy it must be done. MacArthur evidently didn't, and he took the consequences.—(J.C.R.)

Rejected Intellect

Is independent thinking on college campuses becoming a thing of the past? The UCLA Daily Bruin thinks so.

"There is nothing which the average sensual man so detests as being compelled or even asked to think for himself," the Bruin believes.

"Through all the fear and hysteria of the last few years one can detect a conscious rejection of intellectual effort and distinction. They come together here with a deep seated weakness in the American character: a certain shy self-consciousness that tends to deny other interests than those of business, sports and war. There is a powerful strain of our American cast of mind which shuns or even abhors the free thinker and the non-conformist.

"That America, and in miniature our own campus, has flaws in its economic, social, and political structures few deny. If progress is to be achieved, corruption, special privilege, and misuse of power must be spotlighted so that in informed citizenry can make intelligent use of its democratic prerogatives.

"Only the independent, free thinking minds can speak for this nation. And thus, if free thought and non-conformists ever become synonymous with disloyalty, then America will have surrendered its heritage."

—From the Daily Texan.

Midterm Aftermath



"Is it true that you recently gave your class a test made up of unassigned and completely inconsequential material?"

INTERPRETING THE NEWS

President to Retire To Consider Evidence

By J. M. Roberts
AP News Analyst

President Eisenhower will get the evidence Tuesday and "retire to chambers," as the judges say, to ponder it.

Within two or three weeks the country should know his decision.

The President's keen sense of responsibility is well known. Today it makes him an object of sympathy.

People generally know little about what he is thinking. One thing he has said fairly clearly; he does not want to accept an obligation which he might not be able to carry out.

Another thing he has said is that, regardless of how well he has recovered from his heart attack, he isn't the same man physically he was six months ago.

The best doctors can tell him, to bring it down to generalities, is that he has recovered as well as a man his age can be expected to recover from his type of attack.

That would mean the heart has suffered no invalidating damage. It would not mean the conditions which produced the attack have been overcome. A coronary attack can come to almost anyone at almost any time. Doctors dispute whether one attack makes the victim prone to another. The causes are not clear.

There is no dispute, however, that the weight of the presidency is man-killing, and only a few have long-survived it.

Under the circumstances, it

would seem logical for the President to say that he, like any man, wishes to assume no further responsibilities which might interfere with living out his years.

From personal experience I have learned, however, that one can develop a certain confidence about being able to live even with a damaged heart and may, unless a tight leash is held on the spirit, undertake things dangerous to health.

It would be normal for the President to wish to complete the job he undertook so reluctantly in the beginning. That generally is considered to require two terms. His interest in the case of peace alone might persuade him not to quit.

He is bound to feel a certain responsibility to the Republican party, which insisted on putting him into the biggest job in the world. He knows there is a good chance that the work he has done for and through the party could be undone if he stops next year.

It would be strange if such considerations did not weigh heavily with the President, whose way of life has been the pursuit of duty.

Yet it would seem almost incredible that he should gamble his life against them.

All the people can do is stand back, allow him a peaceful time in which to think, and wish for him a wisdom that men seldom have.



The Oregon Daily Emerald is published five days a week during the school year, except Feb. 13, Feb. 23 and 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 JOAN RAINVILLE, Business Manager
SALLY RYAN, Editorial Page Editor JIM CARTER, LAURA MORRIS,
SAM VAHEY, Managing Editor Co-Advertising Managers
JERRY CLAUSSEN, BOB ROBINSON, ANNE HILL, JOE RIGERT,
Associate Editors

ANNE RITCHEY, News Editor NANCY SHAW, Office Manager
CHUCK MITCHELMORE, Sports Editor ARLENE KRAUSS, Nat'l. Adv. Mgr.
EDITORIAL BOARD: Gordon Rice, Jerry Claussen, Chuck Mitchelmore, Anne Ritchey, Bob Robinson, Sally Ryan, Sam Vahey, Anne Hill, Joe Rigert.
Asst. Managing Editor: Marcia Mauney Ass't Sports Editor: Jack Wilson
Asst. News Editors: Al Johnson, Bill Mainwaring, Loretta Meyer, Cornelia Fogle Classified Adv. Mgr. Pat Cushman
Feature Editor: Carol Craig Circulation Mgr. Becky Towler
Women's Editor: Cay Mundorff Executive Secretary: Geri Goebel
Photo Editor: Brant Ducey