

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

EDITORIAL BOARD: Bill Mainwaring, Marcia Maune, 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

Women's Editor: Dorothy West

Nat'l Adv. Mgr.: Jo Anne Milligan

Classified Adv. Mgr.: Arlene Krauss

Photo Editor: Brant Ducey

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.

LORETTA MEYER, Business Manager

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

'... A New Source of Perspective'

The scientist's view of man and nature could easily be incomprehensible to the average University student. As presented by the University's 1957 Condon lecturer it is not only easy to understand but enjoyable.

Tuesday night in the Student Union ballroom, Paul B. Sears was introduced as both a scientist and a humanist, "concerned not only with plants, but with people." And he proved himself just that.

Obviously brilliant, yet completely unassuming, he sincerely presented his science of ecology, the relation of life and environment, in terms that made sense to the non-science major.

But he was talking to too many students who weren't there — students who may have stayed away thinking that the talk would not concern them, would be over their heads.

These students were wrong. Sears was talking to them more than he was to the many scientific minds in the audience.

He has a real message for all of us. He is seeking to give us a "new source of perspective, to help us get our bearings" in a complex world.

These students have another opportunity to hear the personable Yale professor to-night. They should jump at the chance.

(M.M.)

One of the Top Three

Portland State's sponsoring of the statewide college Winter Carnival this weekend has vividly drawn our attention to a fact that not many people in Eugene have noticed, or are willing to acknowledge: Portland State has made tremendous advances in the last ten years and has now become a third member in the "Big Three" of the State System of Higher Education, along with OSC and the University.

Starting as a poorly equipped "junior college," nicknamed "Vanport," right after the war, the school struggled along for a time, housed in quarters that used to be a part of the wartime Vanport housing project. When the floods destroyed this physical plant in May, 1948, many people gave up the college as lost.

It did not pass away, however, and soon acquired the old Lincoln High School building in downtown Portland, taking on the name of Portland State Extension Center. Even more recently it has acquired four year, degree-granting status, and now has a third name, Portland State College.

Through the years, a feeling has grown up that PSC was "just a place for correspondence study," or "a place for guys to

go who flunked out of the University, or "a place for athletes to go to raise their grades," or "a place for people who didn't have enough money to come to the University or OSC." These impressions are erroneous; but, unfortunately, many people still hold them.

Portland State now maintains the same academic entrance requirements as UO and OSC; and in the future will practice the same type of restrictive enrollment as its two big brothers. Furthermore, its athletic teams have been improving; and so has its student government, as evidenced by the Winter Carnival. PSC President John Cramer foresees a tripling in enrollment by 1966.

With this in mind, the people must reshape their thinking to include Portland State as one of the top three institutions in the state system. We at the University may show varying degrees of dislike toward it, as we do toward Oregon State; but we can no longer pretend that it doesn't exist.

The day is coming soon when rivalry shall be high between Oregon, OSC and PSC; and the "Big Three" will be competing actively for the state's top students.

(S.V.)

Fight for Freedom

College Press Praises Hungarians

(ACP)—The Hungarian fight for freedom got editorial as well as news side attention in the college press the past few weeks. The Hungarians got praise, and college editors wondered if they and their fellow students could, if called upon, be as brave.

They did recognize the challenge. For example, from the Collegio, Kansas State Teachers College, Pittsburg, Kansas, comes this editorial.

Hungarian students staked their all for the sake of an idea. Not a selfish, local, egotistical idea, but an idea that was and is universal.

While they gave their lives, and while they continue to sacrifice and shed their blood, many American students are making panty raids, splashing up buildings with unsightly and expounding punitive and in- and expounding punitive and in-

fantile splinters of solely personal ideas in the name of personal freedom, personal rights and as a jab at some imaginary, misconstrued status quo.

The conflict of the Hungarian student is serious business. It can be and it should be a part of our business.

If there are those among the American students who have the time, the energy, the ability, and the spirit to do something big and fine with their lives and for humanity, there is now and there always has been a crying need and place for them.

The size of the student determines the size of the idea, and ideas are the most powerful of weapons.

There are those who take the chaff and leave the plump kernel because it is tough and hard and requires real effort and ability to process into a nourishing product.

There are those who would boldly attack a defenseless cripple but run from a worthy adversary.

There is much work to be done in this one world of ours. There is much work to be done and the workers are few.

There is work that challenges the highest and best that any American student possesses.

There is work for the courageous, the fearless, the brave and the wise.

There is work for those with insight and foresight.

There is work for those who, above all, desire the truth and who are willing to pay the price that finding the truth requires.

If our American students are serious and mature enough to accept the challenge that now faces them, they can make history that will be a recording of benefits to all mankind.



—BECAUSE I'M SKIPPING CLASSES TODAY AN I DON'T WANT ANY OF THESE PROFS TO RECOGNIZE ME.

Letters to the Editor

Emerald Editor:

Here is Susan Campbell again with their dilemma still unsolved.

But, first, we would like to express our appreciation to the people who have written to the Emerald and also to the Register Guard and have backed our feelings on the window breakage episode. We are happy to know that there are several who can see the injustice of the unprecedented decision.

We still feel that the University officials are being terribly unfair in forcing us girls to pay for the damage just because we happen to live in Susan Campbell. What will happen if there is another snow storm and more windows are broken?

The boys, at the present time, are regarding this controversy as a big joke. And why not? They had the fun of breaking the windows (if that can be called fun) and nothing happens to them while the girls are forced to pay for their enjoyment.

Now they have asked us to appeal to the boys and see if the guilty ones can be as conscientious as the girls at the time of the lipstick riot and come forward to assume the responsibility of this bill. In the case of the lipstick riot, Mrs. Wickham asked those who were guilty to sign and we voluntarily did so.

Why can't the dean of men go to the boy's dorms and get the guilty boys to sign or does the dean of men believe the boys have no honor and that he would be unable to find the guilty boys? And if he believes this, why does he think we could succeed where he fails? We doubt that any guilty boy would confess regardless of who made the plea.

Voluntarily we are not going to pay for damage which is beyond our control and which is causing the boys such exuberant joy.

To all those who are interested in our problem, please tell us what to do.

Susan Campbell Hall

Emerald Editor:

An editorial in Wednesday's Emerald laments the deadlock in the organization of the state senate created by an equal number of Republicans and Democrats being on that body.

Despite the fact that many more Democrats were elected in November, the hold-over Republicans make the balance 15 to 15. The writer of the editorial said this was "mostly because the 15 Democrats are too stubborn to meet the Republicans even part way."

This, of course, is but a journalistic restatement of one party's latest propaganda line which originated with the withdrawal of Warren Gill from the race, complete with teletype tears. Surely your writers have a better memory for facts than this. The Republicans went into the Senate organization fight with statements of unalterable opposition to any Democrat, because he was a Democrat.

It was known to them then that Mr. Pearson was the Democratic choice. They said nothing of "personal objections" to him at that time at all. Since then the tune has changed, but only on one side of the political fence.

This brings us to the logical probability of the conclusion drawn, i.e. that it is the Democrats who are blocking Senate organization through stubbornness. This implies belief that the Republicans are not voting for Pearson because of "personal" objections.

Do you believe that not one of the 15 Democrats would find Pearson personally objectionable and not one of the 15 Republicans would be able to find the same personality acceptable? If it's only a "personal" matter with the Republicans, doesn't it seem odd that this coincides exactly with party affiliation? It would only take one Republican vote to end the deadlock, you know.

Edward N. Fadeley
Third Year Law Student
P.S. I wonder why the editorial failed to mention the fact that the Democrats could have had the Senate Presidency on a parliamentary maneuver but declined on that basis?