

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, Ore. Subscription: \$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 Editor: Cay Mundorf, Joan Dennis, Nancy Castle, Pepper Allen.
Feature Editor: Phil Hager
Photo Editor: Brant Ducey
Natl Adv. Mgr.: Jo Anne Milligan
Classified Adv. Mgr.: Arlene Krauss
Women's Editor: Dorothy West
Business Manager: LORETTA MEYER
Asst. Sports Editors: Jerry Ramsey, Jim Larimore
Executive Secretary: Pat Holley
Circulation Mgr.: Sam Vahey
Asst. Sports Editor: Jerry Ramsey, Jim Larimore
Executive Secretary: Pat Holley

Anatomy for Artists 482?



"YOU BOYS WILL FIND IT A LITTLE EASIER TO DRAW IF YOU STEP BACK FROM THE MODEL A LITTLE."

AWS: Try 'All Profits for Scholarships'

When the Budget Board decides to spend or not spend money originating from student fees it should be of interest to all of us. A recent decision refusing \$925 to Associated Women Students, after the request had been endorsed by the ASUO Cabinet and Senate, is of major significance.

Hidden beneath the obvious was the issue: Should student funds be used to subsidize scholarship? The Budget Board unanimously decided they should not.

Last year AWS was criticized because of its "scholarship fund" money-raising projects. It was pointed out that much of the money collected was used to pay general operating expenses of the organization, including convention trips.

AWS President Helen Johnson's proposal was that if the Budget Board would pay for the general expenses of the organization, then all money raised could be put into scholarships. So in effect the student funds would indirectly be paying for scholarships for other students.

Should the general student body subsidize scholarships for women only, or for anyone? We're inclined to agree with the Budget Board, despite the need for more scholarships.

So apparently it is up to AWS to bill their projects as "all profit for scholarships." It seems unlikely that this would seriously interfere with their financial success.

Mayflower — A Sad Farewell

There's something more than a sentimental twinge of pain in seeing the Mayflower theater close its doors for good Saturday night. There is, of course, some regret in bidding farewell to one of the little circle of businesses in the University's own "little downtown." And it will hurt alums and old friends of the neighborhood who recall a "big date" and one of the Mayflower's good films.

But more than that, the closing of the

Mayflower hurts us for what it will mean after this Saturday. There'll be no more of Alec Guinness and Fernandel, no more of Gina Lollobrigida in Italian or French, no more Charlie Chaplin. It'll mean no more asking a gal to a movie because you could walk her to the Mayflower, but not to Wilamette. And, it'll mean no chance to pick up on a good "second run" after (or even before) a mid-term or final. The Mayflower is gone — and it hurts. (C.H.M.)

'Man of the Year: An Inspiration

An annual honor of quite some significance is Time magazine's yearly selection for Man of the Year. Normally reserved for scientists, entertainers, athletes and statesmen, the award for 1956 went to an enigma of heroism — the Hungarian Freedom Fighter.

We feel that the magazine, alternately damned and praised by self-anointed experts on weekly journalism, has done itself proud in joining millions of Americans in sincere affection for a people that were gutsy enough to fight back in the face of overwhelming odds.

Ironically, their uprising meant very little in terms of material gain or government recovered. But its value in the more intangible element of world opinion and the satisfying feeling of upholding a sacred principle made the historic revolution a national success.

As in all political upheavals, many were unable to survive for the reckoning of the future, due to callous Russian action — for which they have long since become justly infamous. But here we can only hope and pray that their efforts have awakened an indifferent world to the plight of the satellite nations and their national bonds of freedom-seeking.

We can't help but consider the picture of a war-ravaged Budapest in an American city. War has never come with its true impact on the United States soil, but the Freedom Fighter wouldn't know about that. While he threw rocks at Red tanks, we had lipstick riots and mid-terms.

We're not blaming anyone in the U.S. for the unfortunate situation in Europe. But serious thought in considering our country

under similar circumstances may help in the realization of what a feat the Hungarians performed in having control of the country for one hour, let alone several days.

Like his previous counterparts in East Germany and Poland, the Hungarian reacted instinctively to his chance for upsetting the Russian appellation (in the form of tanks). Heroes were made from high school children to the aged.

Freedom, as our ancestors learned long ago, cannot be bought easily. And this was long prior to the age of mechanized oppression. The Hungarian has known it for many years as well, and truly the hard way.

We're sorry, in a sense, that political and security considerations rendered the U.S. unable to actively assist the Hungarians in their break for freedom. Sheltering refugees by the thousands has helped immeasurably.

We want to join with Time in recognizing courage in the face of impossible odds. And we hope that the 1956 Man of the Year's example will be an inspiration for future winners. With such a formula for freedom, little can be lost. (A.J.)

Footnotes

No news is good news runs the trite old saw, which means that if the usual sources are true to form, we're loaded with the best. The squirrels are asleep somewhere, campus dogs are conspicuous by their inactivity, there are no grounds for riots or effigies and the weather is standard. (Don't read this aloud and maybe it'll stay that way.)

Interpreting the News

Dulles Fogs Ike's Plan: 'Ace of Spades in Tunnel'

By JAMES MARLOW
AP News Analyst

WASHINGTON (AP)—Secretary of State Dulles has thrown so much fog around President Eisenhower's program for the Middle East that now it is just about as clear as the ace of spades in a tunnel.

So far the sound effects from this program have been good: the administration did a bangup job in publicizing it. Now it's up to the administration to show what, if anything, is behind the sound.

This much seems visible: Eisenhower wants congressional authority to use U.S. armed forces in the Middle East, if necessary, to stop a Communist or Communist-inspired attack on a non-Communist country.

But that's just one part of the program. These other parts are all clouded over: Eisenhower also wants to give economic aid and military assistance—meaning arms—to nations in the Middle East.

Dulles spent 4½ hours Monday explaining the program to the House Foreign Affairs Committee in public hearing. When he got all through these two questions needed answering:

Will the economic aid Eisenhower talks about really amount to much more, if any more, than the aid already being given to the Middle East? And will this country really provide any more arms than it has been giving away?

The questions put to Dulles by the committee members in public—no one knows what was said in a secret session yesterday—were neither sharp nor persistent. He'll have a rougher time next week before Senate committees.

This country has two basic programs for providing Middle Eastern countries with arms.

1. Under the mutual security program a nation receiving arms agrees to let in American officers to supervise their use. This ties them in militarily,

more or less, with this country. Under this program only three countries in the area—Iran, Iraq and Turkey—have received arms.

2. Within limits, the United States sells arms for cash. It has sold very little. Dulles has kept the price high—so high that Egypt bought its arms from Russia—and explains he doesn't want an arms race in the Middle East.

How will the new program change anything? It's hard to see how it will change anything at all. Dulles told the House committee that this country will not, under the new program, depart from its policy of not being a "primary" source of arms to the Middle East.

This is the picture, or part of it, on the economic aid the administration talks of as part of this new program:

The Arab countries and Israel in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, received \$176,757,000 (if Turkey and Greece were added it would be \$301,386,000) in economic aid. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, they received \$109,631,000. If Turkey and Greece were added it would be \$244,286,000.

But Eisenhower talks of wanting to spend 200 million dollars a year in the Middle East. Would that be just a total of 200 million? If so, it wouldn't be a lot more than those countries have been receiving. Or would it be \$200 million in addition to the present rate of aid? That hasn't been explained.

One of the primary questions, of course, is: Do they need all that money and would they know what to do with it if they got it? Some House members complained last week the waste of American aid money in Iran has been "shocking."

Dulles added to the puzzlement by stating that the 54 million he had earmarked to help Egypt build the Aswan Dam—but then canceled—would not be given. But the dam is what Egypt says it needs.

What, then, will be done for Egypt, which right now is the biggest danger spot in the Middle East? No public answer to that one yet either.

