

+ EMERALD EDITORIALS +

Faculty Criticism

Formal criticism of faculty members by their students is a touchy subject to bring before a board of deans or a faculty senate, but that is exactly what an ASUO committee will be doing in the next few weeks.

ASUO President Bud Hinkson announced Thursday night that he would appoint a committee in the near future to take the idea of a faculty rating system to the professors. Fortunately, because of opposition within the ASUO, the committee will do nothing more than offer its aid in carrying out a rating system.

We say fortunately because we do not believe this is a legitimate field for student activity. If the dean or the professors in a department voluntarily ask the students to criticize them, that is a different matter, but students themselves have no business informing the professor that "we are going to rate you."

The prospect of being rated by students nearly always brings out the cry of "academic freedom." This seems to be stretching the point a little far, but there are excellent arguments against such a plan.

First, there is a question whether students are qualified to judge the qualities of their professors. Many professors insist that a student is not qualified to judge a teacher until he has had at least five years to look back on a class and evaluate it. There seems to be general agreement that the lower division instructors are the ones who have the most room for improvement and who would benefit most from such a rating system. Yet the lower division students generally lack even the maturity and judgment acquired in three or four years of college. They are the ones least qualified to judge a professor.

Secondly, there is a question whether some of the criticism would be sincere. How many students would deliberately downgrade a professor because he gave them a C or D the term before? The temptation would be pretty strong in some cases, and there's no doubt that some students would do it.

Third, and this is by far the most important, how much good would it do? There is some truth to the statement that "The professors who want to be criticized are the ones that don't need it." This is not true in every case, of course, but in our experience the best-liked professors have been the ones who are most in favor of a system of student criticism.

The ones who don't want to be evaluated are the ones who will be most impervious to their students' comments. If the ASUO attempts to force this thing down the throats of the faculty, it will not only fail to improve the quality of the teaching, but result in worsening relations between the students and the faculty.

We can see little value in the plan if the faculty supports it voluntarily and lots of harm if it's done without that support.

Time of Tension

From the Daily Texan:

Dead passions and the ghosts of the year are alive in the South again today.

Has retrospect so eluded us?

The shadow which was the Civil War, concealed for almost a century in the folklore of grandparents and the cloth of provincialism, seems to have fallen with a fatalism that evokes only the most bitter of ironies.

The legal manifestations, evasion, postponement, and open defiance come as warnings that the nation has entered a tense and trying period. Organized resistance to fed-

eral law has been well-entrenched only at one other point in our history.

Open disobedience to the Constitution is common throughout the South. In Alabama, Virginia, Florida, and North Carolina subtle arrangements bordering on legality are being used to elude the Supreme Court desegregation edict. Alabama's legislature has been more blunt: it has simply deemed the Court decision null and void. Nine Southern states are reviving the obscure and questionable doctrine of interposition. Among them is Texas, where Governor Shivers and Attorney General Shepperd are waging a rather successful campaign to capture the imagination of the electorate. The Texas position is somewhat different from that of other states; one has ample reason to believe that the natural gas veto, as much as desegregation, has prompted the pronounced reaction to federal authority.

The period we are entering cannot be described solely in legal terms. The protest against law stems from the question of race, a problem which is mostly instinctive, deeply imbedded in unreason and passion. Hence the depth of the struggle: it is being fought by both regions, North and South, with intemperance, ill-will, chauvinism and impatience.

In this drift away from the Constitution, ours is the pivotal generation in the South. The personal dilemma cannot we dismissed by non-Southerners as a product of prejudice and hate. We of the South are all imbued with a well-advertised way of life, proud, generous, and undeniably beautiful. Our provincialism is healthy and loyal, and our heritage is nothing certainly to forget. But it is clear today, and we are seeing it, that our regional loyalty is conflicting fundamentally, almost viciously, with the long-tested concept of ultimate federal authority.

The existence of this final authority must be upheld. It is, to understate, the thread that binds us all together. To deny it is to invite anarchy and to invite anarchy is to kill the land.

The legal base of a nation or a people might seem a cold and impersonal kind of bond; it is far more than legal. It grasps and encloses every conceivable emotion, every possible act. It is, as a last and most basic recognition, the base of the nation.

Swift integration is unfeasible in many sections. That is why the North must not press forward as vigorously as it has; to do so is to prompt an equating extremism in the South, with the same counter-results. And in the South, the supremacy of the Constitution must not be wrecked by the stormy game of politics.

This, above all, should be underscored. The Southern race issue must be divorced from emotionalism, both in the North and the South. Outcries favoring interpositions or threats of Federal military invasion, both rising more from political expediency than anything else, are harmful and killing.

Footnotes

Something our mothers never told us is the way that the campus males actually vie for a title: to wit, The Ugliest Man on the Campus. At least it's a change from the beauty contests—pseudonyms may be used, we understand. Maybe aliases would be better.

* * * *

Preferential voting, plurality, majority—many more steps and state and local government will have to be made a required course for all Oregon students.

* * * *

Here's hoping one of the women's living organizations draws Hawaii to represent at the mock political convention. We understand that delegates showed up in native garb at the last such event.

Question Period



"I'VE WAITED FIVE YEARS FOR SOMEONE TO ASK ME THAT QUESTION."

INTERPRETING THE NEWS

U.S. Hoped for Time, Change in Attitude

By J. M. Roberts
AP News Analyst

Seven or eight years ago, when the United States was developing its policy of Communist containment, the hope was that time could be gained for changes in the attitude of the Soviet Union itself.

There has been a change, at least in outward appearance. Whether it runs deep enough to have any effect on international relations remains doubtful.

But Secretary Dulles, after recounting the basic differences between the free world and the Soviet Union, repeats that there is room for hope.

Before he spoke, Moscow publications were developing and intensifying their attacks on the record of Stalin.

Dulles thinks this campaign may represent recognition by the present government that Stalin's repressive policies pushed the people too hard, producing counter-pressure for more democracy which must be allayed. He thinks the present rulers must have seen that international resistance to communism's threat of force required a new approach.

The secretary calls this a demonstration that liberalizing influences from within and without can bring about peaceful change.

Nevertheless, he points out, the government of Russia is still a dictatorship, "and the new five-year plan shows a continuing purpose to magnify the might of the Soviet state at the

expense of the well-being of most of the people who are ruled."

The difficulty of accurately assessing the meaning of new Soviet twists and turns is emphasized, however, by the phraseology of the Communist anti-Stalin campaign. To accuse Stalin of "destroying the principle of democracy in the Soviet Union," where no democracy has ever existed at any time, is a distortion which becomes meaningless.

That's one of the drawbacks to a change in Russia of the type the West would like so much to see. The Russian people have always been exploited by their governments, and, instead of believing in the possibility of a democratic way of life, even the more sensible among them rarely get farther than a desire for a change.

Dulles once discussed the possibility that the change would be produced by the rise to power of a group of patriots who would place the national welfare ahead of the expansionist theories of the Communist Party. It is noticeable, in this connection, that in all their talk against Stalinism the present leaders have never approached this point. Instead, they reiterate with all their force that communism will win the world.

As long as they persist in this crusade there can be no change sufficient to permit a reconciliation of international difficulties.



The Oregon Daily Emerald is published five days a week during the school year 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, Co-Advertising Managers

SAM VAHEY, Managing Editor 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, Chuck Mitchelmore, Anne Ritchey, Bob Robinson, Sally Ryan, Sam Vahey, Anne Hill, Joe Rigert.

Ass't Managing Editor: Marcia Mauney Photo Editor: Brant Ducev

Ass't News Editors: Al Johnson, Bill Mainwaring, Loretta Meyer, Cornelia Fogle Ass't Sports Editor: Jack Wilson

Ass't Advertising Mgr.: Shirley Parmenter Classified Adv. Mgr.: Pat Cushman

Nat'l Adv. Mgr.: Sharon Rafferty Ass't Office Mgr.: Becky Towler

Feature Editor: Carol Craig Circulation Mgr.: Jim Larimore

Women's Editor: Cay Mundorff Executive Secretary: Geri Goebel