

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.

BILL MAINWARING, Editor
MARCIA MAUNEY, Editorial Page Editor
SALLY JO GREIG, SAM VAHEY, Associate Editors
JACK WILSON, Sports Editor
DOROTHY BARKER, Ass't Adv. Mgr.
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 Mundorff, Joan Dennis, Nancy Castle, Pepper Allen.
Feature Editor: Phil Hager
LORETTA MEYER, Business Manager
CHUCK MITCHELMORE, Managing Editor
KEN NIEHANS, Adv. Mgr.
CORNELIA FOGLE, News Editor
CHARMION FORD, Office Manager
Circulation Mgr.: Sam Vahey
Asst. Sports Editors: Jerry Ramsey, Jim Larimore
Executive Secretary: Pat Holley

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.

Too Much Hell Week Can Only Hurt

"The worst thing about fraternities is their public relations" is a common phrase of Greek Week speakers. And the worst thing about their public relations is invariably the publicity resulting from Hell Week rampages.

Fraternity Hell Weeks are now underway on this campus. To a lesser extent Orientation Weeks and Help Weeks are also underway.

Oregon's 21 fraternities, through Help Week, have great opportunity to put their best collective foot forward; but Hell Week exposes them to the danger of making the type of blunders which cause terrible publicity.

Hell Week is often described as a period in which immaturity is encouraged to exhibit itself in the extreme.

It is ironic that some fraternity leaders would like to get away from the meaningless play of Hell Week, but are afraid that that doing so would disappoint their pledges. Pledges of one fraternity, it is reasoned, would feel cheated if their Hell Week stories were pale by comparison to those of their dormitory buddies in other houses. What type of initiation a fraternity chooses to conduct is strictly its own business, pro-

vided it doesn't get out of bounds and terrorize the public. Perhaps it is therefore out of place for outsiders to make suggestions in this area.

It does, however, seem to us that fraternities whose pre-initiation program consists of seven "Fun Nights" in succession are passing up a real opportunity.

Perhaps in the case of a single fraternity, one "Fun Night" must be retained as a compromise with the facts of life as expressed in dormitory bull sessions. If so we suggest that it be incorporated into a broad program. This program should be designed primarily to mold better fraternity men, not to provide entertainment for boys.

Hell Week, in minor and restrained form, still has a place in the fraternity initiation. But so should Help Week. And more important to the future of the fraternity and the men, so should much thought-provoking orientation on the fraternity and its ideals.

It is the professional critics who do all the harping about cleaning up Hell Week, much to the disgust of the fraternities. Yet it is the fraternities themselves who have the most to gain by doing so.

'In Professional Sea'

Stanford 'Island of Intellectualism'

Editor's Note: The following editorial is reprinted from a recent Stanford Daily. It does paint a sad, plaintive picture, but we doubt if the Palo Alto people are the only ones who are worried about the problem. See the sports page for one UO official's attitude toward professionalism.

The Pacific Coast Conference is going professional. And Stanford is the only school that seems seriously worried about it.

In its meeting last week the conference opened the door to unlimited financial aid by adopting its grants-in-aid for subsistence. The pressure from Fred Fagg of USC and Raymond Allen of UCLA and the worry at dropping nine out of ten Bowl games to the Big Ten have been too much for the rest of the schools.

Under the new athletic code, players would be given needed money beyond the amount already handed them in the form of grants-in-aid tuition and money earned by them in on-campus jobs. We hold that this amounts to hiring athletes. And the practice of a faculty agency determining the amount of subsistence grants-in-aid to be handed to the athlete would be a farce.

This is the way Stanford President Sterling feels and this is the way he has voted. We firmly agree with him that if a student wants to play football,

that is his business. If he can't support himself working the same hours under the same conditions as any other student, then he has no right to play football. Tuition grants should be determined solely on academic performance and financial need. If they are sufficiently good students, athletes would receive their proportion of grants and scholarships.

Unfortunately, Stanford stands practically alone on this subject. It is the only school that is standing for a university emphasis on academics above athletics. Sterling has long said he would not be willing to sacrifice his academic principles to keep Stanford in the Pacific Coast Conference.

The ball is rolling away from Sterling's educational philosophy and toward big-money athletics. Though it is doubtful that they could meet the financial obligations brought about by the new, confusing code, the smaller schools are apparently anxious to be counted among the big boys.

Stanford is a singularly unique institution on the West Coast. It is the only large school west of the Mississippi with a nationally famous, high academic reputation. If it leaves the conference it will be faced with the prospect of having no schools within a thousand miles in a similar situation which it could play.

When faced with a comparable situation a few years

ago, the Ivy League schools abolished spring practice, quit recruiting practices, withdrew into their own league and are now playing practically no outsiders. They have retained their high academic standing and are still enjoying good football.

Northwestern was faced with a problem like Stanford's. It also found itself an island of intellectualism in a sea of professionalism. The university had to surrender and go big time along with the rest of the conference.

The question stares us bleakly in the face. Where does Stanford go from here? There is a slight hope that in May, when the PCC convenes again, it will ignore the wishes of southern California sports writers and chancellors, and go back to amateur athletics, leaving the "play for pay" on the West Coast to the San Francisco 49ers and the Los Angeles Rams.

But if this doesn't happen, it will force Stanford, as Sterling has put it, "to re-examine the nature of its participation in intercollegiate athletics."

If the present athletic code remains, this re-examination can come to but one conclusion—leave the Pacific Coast Conference. The combination of sacrificing faculty salaries, scholarships, or building money and placing athletics above education is just too much. No sport, no matter how enjoyable, is worth this.

Those Eager Beavers



"THE DEAN WANTS TO KNOW IF YOU'D WAIT TO DEMONSTRATE TECHNIQUES ON THE DAY YOUR CLASS GOES TO THE WOODS."

Interpreting the News

Leaders Can't Agree About Saving Middle East

By JAMES MARLOW
AP News Analyst

WASHINGTON (AP)—The leaders of government, past and present, agree something should be done to save the Middle East from Russia. But they don't exactly agree on how. The result is more confusion.

President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles are vague on how to carry out the plan they've offered. Former President Truman backs them and then adds a tough idea of his own.

Yet former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, who helped Truman form his foreign policies, seems in disagreement with Eisenhower and Truman on a basic point and most certainly is in disagreement with Dulles.

The problem shared by the United States and Russia, each of whom wants to keep the Middle East away from the other, is how to win friends and influence people there.

Sometimes lost sight of in the present wide debate on American policy in the Middle East is what the people who live there think of it and whether they want it and, above all, what the Russians think.

Eisenhower proposes using American armed forces to stop any aggression in the area by a Communist or Communist-inspired government against a non-Communist state, if the latter asks for help.

In addition, he wants to give nations in the area both arms and economic aid.

Truman backs this, even though Eisenhower and Dulles have been utterly foggy on how they'll distribute the arms or the aid. But Truman goes them one better:

He says he'd forbid Russia to ship arms to any nation in the area. He seems to forget the Russians and the Arab countries are independent states who like to think they can buy and sell where they please.

This kind of talk from Tru-

man may seem, to the Arabs, a simple declaration of intent to treat them as American colonies, although being colonies is exactly what they don't want, or say they don't.

The Russians, being a huge military power, could hardly be expected to let the United States get away with a ban on Soviet arms shipments, unless they bluff easily. Truman, judging from what he said yesterday, seems to think the Russians would back down.

Dulles, whose job is to explain Eisenhower's policy on the Mid-East, indicated to Congress last week that in sending American forces to stop "overt" Red aggression in the area President Eisenhower would decide whether Russia was trying to start World War III.

In such a situation, Dulles went on, Eisenhower would decide whether to make an all-out attack on the Soviet Union.

This policy at least would call for waiting for the Red attack before Americans started to shoot. But Truman's warning to Russia not to sell arms would call for a showdown before any shooting and, if Russia asserted its sovereignty by selling arms, it would probably lead to World War III.

Acheson, testifying before Truman's statement appeared, recoiled even from Dulles stand and said it appears "perilously like another approach to the brink."

This was a sarcastic reference to a statement by Dulles last year in Life magazine that the art of statesmanship was to get to the brink of war without falling in.

Acheson himself—in his testimony before Congress and in a long article he wrote for the New York Times a week ago—doesn't seem very clear either on the precise solution he'd offer if he was now the secretary.

The Russians listed to the discussion of American policy in this country for the past week and then over the weekend gave a warning of their own: that the Eisenhower-Dulles doctrine may lead to "dangerous consequences."