

Oregon Daily EMERALD

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published five days a week during the school year, except during examinations 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 Emerald and do not pretend to represent the opinion of the ASUO or the University. Unsigned editorials are written by the editor; initialed editorials by members of the editorial board.

BILL MAINWARING, Editor
MARCIA MAUNEY, Editorial Page Editor **CHUCK MITCHELMORE**, Managing Editor **KEN NIEHANS**, Adv. Mgr.
SALLY JO GREIG, SAM VAHEY, Associate Editors **CORNELIA FOGLE**, News Editor
JACK WILSON, Sports Editor **DOROTHY BARKER**, Ass't Adv. Mgr. **CHARMION FORD**, Office Manager
EDITORIAL BOARD: Bill Mainwaring, Marcia Mauney, Sally Jo Greig, Sam Vahey, Chuck Mitchelmore, Cornelia Fogle, Jack Wilson, Al Johnson.
Chief Make-up Editor: Al Johnson
Ass't News Editors: Cay Mundorff, Joan Dennis, Nancy Castle, Pepper Allen.
Feature Editor: Phil Hager
Photo Editor: Brant Ducey
Nat'l Adv. Mgr.: Jo Anne Milligan
Classified Adv. Mgr.: Arlene Krauss
Women's Editor: Dorothy West
Circulation Mgr.: Sam Vahey
Asst. Sports Editors: Jerry Ramsey, Jim Larimore
Executive Secretary: Geri Gobel

The Brodie Method?



"No wonder his passes are so great today—he had some good practice last night."

Fraternity Controversy — Worth Reading

Does the fraternity system contribute to or detract from the American university?

This is the theme of two articles printed recently in American Weekly, a supplement of The Sunday Oregonian. The Emerald is re-printing "The Case Against Fraternities" on page three of today's paper and will publish "The Case for Fraternities" Tuesday.

This question has been of vital concern to educators and students for many years. The fraternity system (which includes sororities) is an important part of this University, and a discussion of its merits should therefore be of vital interest to the University community.

"There's nothing wrong with fraternities, so why read that stuff?" This was the spontaneous comment of one Oregon fraternity man when he opened the magazine to this article. We hope this attitude is not typical of the American fraternity man; if

it is Mr. Wilson's attack has added evidence.

The Emerald does not print this attack just to supply new ideas to those who attack the fraternity system from without. Such criticism should be most valuable to the system's leaders, for it shows them real or partially imaginary ills which could be cured.

Whatever one's general view of the merits of the fraternity system, few would argue that it couldn't be improved. The conflicting ideas presented today and tomorrow should stimulate thinking within the system.

Footnotes

Among recent innovations in campaign signs: "McYak," and "I Envy the Horse that Kicked Wayne Morse."

The Skeptic Tank

Political Trends at UO Discovered by Pollsters

By BRIAN BOOTH
Emerald Columnist

"There's nothing like an election year to bring out the voters," my sage-like political science professor used to tell his classes before he sabbatically left Oregon for a year's stint writing campaign speeches for Douglas McArthur. And certainly this fall the old fellow's words are ringing true. For experts are predicting that more voters will go the polls Nov. 6, than at any time since the previous election.



Here at Oregon with elections less than a month away, the sound of political fury is ringing in the ears of the University community. On every street corner, beneath the statue of the Pioneer Mother and around cars in the Sammie parking lot clusters of students are to be found excitedly expounding on candidates and issues.

The casual atmosphere which usually prevails in campus coffee shops has even succumbed to the more hectic aura of things political. And zealous Democrats and Republicans drawn out juke boxes in these places by shouting their views from table tops or while running up and down the counter.

The way Oregon students are thinking about voting should be of real importance to the candidates. For if the size of this year's record-breaking crowds at "Maxie's" are a good yardstick, then the voting strength of university students should be greater than ever before.

So to give the candidates and the general public a glimpse of the voting trends at Oregon we enlisted the aid of the members of Scabbard and Blade and Skull and Dagger (two sharp groups) to take an informal poll among the student body.

Of course our big question concerned the Morse-McKay race for the Senate which has been billed as the most im-

portant national contest next to the one for president.

Interest in the senatorial battle is at a high peak all over the state, but it has special significance for the University since Sen. Morse was formerly an Oregon law school dean before he was elected to the Senate.

So to capture the feeling of Oregon students our pollsters asked the following question: Which candidate do you feel could best serve the people of Oregon in the United States Senate? Results of our poll turned out to be rather surprising in lieu of what other polls have shown. We got the following answers, expressed in percentages, to the question.

Wayne Morse	5%
Dean Morris	9%
Phillip Morris	8%
Johnny McKay	7%
Douglas McKay	4%
A. B. "Happy" Chandler	5%
Unable to comprehend question	35%
To intoxicated to speak	20%
Wouldn't talk to strangers	7%

Conclusions to be drawn from the above results are too apparent to enumerate. However before you run outside to place any bets let us remind you that the views expressed apply only to college students who are traditionally of a more liberal bent of mind than the general populace. And don't forget there is still plenty of time for people to change their minds.

Our poll showed that political thinking on the campus is pretty varied. However we think that Eddie Arrappaho, junior in business from Toledo, did a good job of summing up the voting habits of most Oregon students.

Arrappaho, who pays his school expenses by collecting wine bottles in the student stands after football games and selling them, told one of our pollsters in his slow, confident tone: "I try to figure out how I'm going to vote by picking out who I think is best by determining which candidate would be better for the good of the most on the basis of which is right." We'll buy that.

Twin Candidates?

Ike and Adlai Alike in Introducing Nothing New, Making Similar Promises

By JAMES MARLOWE
AP News Analyst

WASHINGTON (AP)—There is a twinship between President Eisenhower and Adlai Stevenson not only in the promises they make but in the lack of new ideas in this campaign.

Eisenhower has offered no new ideas at all. Neither has Stevenson with two possible exceptions: on the H-bomb and school aid. Eisenhower is vaguer on his promises although Stevenson in most cases is pretty vague too.

An American who looks at the two parties with fixed prejudices or new enthusiasms may feel he discerns big differences between the men. To an impartial European this election may look like a choice between two managers for the same store.

Both men, moderate and conservative, are basically alike in their outlook: they agreed the social progress of this country must be retained. They're not offering to change it but only to improve it.

Thus voters must make their choice on small differences rather than big or radical ones: which man can do the White House job better, and whose programs, since they are generally similar, look a little better.

On foreign affairs Eisenhower and Stevenson basically see eye to eye on a need for alliances and continued foreign aid.

And on the really fiery issues of the day—getting the South to accept the Supreme Court's

ruling against public school segregation—both men have expressed only platitudes. Neither has offered a program or a solution.

On this issue Stevenson has taken a little stronger stand than Eisenhower: he at least says he approves the court's decision. Eisenhower, asked several times if he endorses the decision, has never said he did but must, as president, back it up.

Eisenhower — whose theme is peace, prosperity and progress — stands on his record, belittles the Democrats, promises to expand existing programs or get action on measures previously introduced in Congress but not yet approved.

Stevenson — with no White House record of his own — points with pride to past performances of the Democrats, belittles the Republicans, and in general makes the same kind of promises as Eisenhower: expansion and action on measures already discussed.

One notable difference between the two men is in their farm programs: Eisenhower assures the farmers they'll make out fine under his flexible price support policy; Stevenson says they'll do better with higher rigid supports.

Eisenhower so far has not gone into details on anything he's promised. Stevenson has gone into detail on three programs: health, education, and older people.

If two of Stevenson's ideas can be considered new, these are the ones:

1. He has proposed the United States take the lead toward ending H-bomb tests. If he is suggesting they be ended without ironclad agreement with Russia

to do the same, that would be new. But it still is not clear precisely what he has in mind.

2. Instead of suffering the kind of school aid bill debated in Congress this year — to give states money only for building schools — For example: one might need money to train teachers more than to build schools.

Eisenhower and Stevenson, as is usual in a campaign, have exaggerated the differences between them and between their parties. But the general similarity of their programs can be seen from this list which both have proposed:

Erasing the schoolroom shortage, prosperity for the farmers, although by different methods; medical research; housing; jobs for older people; steps to ease unemployment; soil conservation; water resources development and new supplies of power; special laws to protect small business men; peaceful use of atomic energy.

Letters to the Editor

Emerald Editor:

We would agree with the editorial writer's views on the value of a liberal education, which appeared in Thursday's Emerald, but are of the hopeful conviction that few University students are in accord with the finality and the certainty of the concluding statement: "We should truly be proud to say, 'I will be educated when I graduate'."

B. Joyce Spillman
Senior in Political Science