

Oregon Daily EMERALD

The Graduate Assistant

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
SALLY JO GREIG, Associate Editor
JACK WILSON, Sports Editor
EDITORIAL BOARD: Bill Mainwaring, Marcia Mauney, Jack Wilson, Al Johnson

CHUCK MITCHELMORE, Managing Editor
SAM VAHEY, Associate Editor
GLEN GRAVES, Ass't. Adv. Mgr.
WOMEN'S EDITOR: Dorothy West
Nat'l Adv. Mgr.: Jo Anne Milligan
Classified Adv. Mgr.: Arlene Krauss
Photo Editor: Nathan Bull
Ad Make-up Editor: Warren Rucker

KEN NIEHANS, Business Manager
DOROTHY BARKER, Adv. Mgr.
CORNELIA FOGLE, News Editor
CHARMION FORD, Office Manager
Circulation Mgr.: Sam Vahey
Asst. Sports Editor: Jerry Ramsey, Tom Chapman
Executive Secretary: Pat Holley

Chief Make-up Editor: Al Johnson
Ass't News Editor: Cay Mundorf, Joan Dennis, Nancy Castle, Evelyn Olsen, Nancy Ferguson,
Feature Editor: Phil Hager

Have We Learned from Them?

Persons from other countries offer Americans a unique chance to learn, and as University students we have an added opportunity to explore the customs and cultures of countries other than our own.

Here on campus are approximately 180 students representing 46 countries other than the United States. And their number is increasing annually. They represent countries of every habitable continent - Europe, Asia, Africa, Australia, North America and South America. And each international student has something which he can offer the University of Oregon.

In the Student Union the other evening a group of these students talked rapidly in their native language. Unconsciously they used American mannerisms, and American slang expressions interrupted their conversation from time to time. They had been learning from people as well as from books.

But have we Americans learned from them? In our smugness we think only of the experience they will obtain during their stay in the United States. We wonder, if they properly appreciate our modern conveniences and our "enlightened" ideas. The mutual benefit to be obtained is forgotten.

Too many of us forget that we are being offered a chance to learn of different countries, beliefs and cultures. In our false superiority we consider everything "American" to be right, while other ideas are disregarded. Students from other countries, or those with beliefs other than our own we consider "foreign" or "different".

Whether students from other countries are fundamentally different from American students, we don't know. Different philosophies and different religious beliefs guide various members of the human race in different ways. But if a basic difference does exist, it should whet our curiosity and make us want to learn more about these people.

Perhaps we will find that people of different nationalities are more similar than we think, perhaps not. But why we blindfold our eyes and plug our ears instead of finding out the facts?

Only by getting to know another student, one with a different creed, race or national origin, by understanding his view-point, his ambitions and goals can we bury our old prejudices.

Then we learn to accept or reject a person strictly on his merits as a human being, and not because he happens to be of a different race or religion.

Only when we, as American students, realize that learning is a two-way proposition, can we fully enjoy the experiences made available to us by our international students.

We must take advantage of their knowledge, and this we can do only when we understand them as individuals. The artificial nationality barrier must be broken down, for the fund of knowledge available to us through these students is too important to waste. (C.F.)



"LOOK-IF I KNEW ALL THE RIGHT ANSWERS I WOULDN'T BE TEACHING!"

Interpreting the News

Mid-East Dilemma Faces Ike and Leaders Today

By JAMES MARLOW
AP News Analyst

WASHINGTON (AP)—President Eisenhower's meeting with congressional leaders today is an encore. He met with them 51 days ago on the same problem: the Middle East. In that time the problem has deepened.



So has confusion over this country's thinking on the Middle East, including Israel. For 51 days the administration—or, rather, Secretary of State Dulles—has talked almost continually on the Middle East.

In that time the cherished Democratic-Republican bipartisanship has been badly split. And Dulles has been treated to the most angry Democratic criticism of his four years in office, even to being called a "liar."

If Dulles had talked less, and more to the point, there would now be a clearer understanding at home and abroad of what the administration has in mind on the Middle East in general and Israel in particular.

Instead of letting Democratic congressional leaders be the first to know of the program and tell how they felt, the administration—meaning Dulles' State Department—"leaked" it to a newspaper Dec. 28.

Democrats have indicated since they consider this an attempt to build up public pressure on them for approval before Eisenhower ever asked for their views. His program was a three-in-one package. He wanted congressional approval for:

private homes, or are they profit-making ventures such as boarding houses would be." Could not one put it another way: are fraternities, etc., private corporations, like country-clubs or private clubs, or are they public institutions like state-owned dormitories?

Also, isn't there a distinction between private clubs and corporations, which may well be

(Continued on page three)

Huge economic aid to the Middle East, although who'll get it, and how and why, is not clear; gifts of arms to certain Middle Eastern countries; and use of American armed forces to stop Communist aggression in the area.

There followed many days of testimony by Dulles and other administration officials before congressional committees, publicly and behind closed doors. In all he said Dulles followed one consistent line: vagueness. It irritated Democrats.

The House has approved the program. The Senate, starting debate on it this week, will probably put some strings on it. Meanwhile, something else had been happening.

Israel had ignored the United Nations' demand that it quit territory claimed by Egypt, contending it first must have guarantees against Egyptian attack. The Arab members of the U.N. were getting set to ask for sanctions against Israel for defying the world organization.

But the U.N. has not even considered sanctions against a big power—Russia—which ignored the U.N. demand that it get out of Hungary.

Israel not only is a friend of the United States, which helped create it, but has a lot of friends in this country, including members of Congress, who oppose sanctions against it.

But if the United States refuses to vote sanctions against Israel, it would antagonize the Arabs at the moment the administration is trying to win them over with Eisenhower's program.

In the hope of avoiding such a showdown, Dulles asked Israel to pull back its troops. But Israel refused Dulles just as it had refused the U.N.

Now the squeeze is on. The Democratic Policy Committee in the Senate voted unanimously yesterday against sanctions on Israel. And Eisenhower's own Republican Senate leader, William Knowland of California, has come out flatly against sanctions.

Dulles will now have to talk his way out of this one, or get in deeper.

— Letters to the Editor —

Emerald Editor:

In his editorial of Tuesday, Feb. 19, on "We Question Women's Dorm Restrictions," S.V. asked several rhetoric questions. Some of them concern the reactions and the position of the international students on this problem.

Most international students realize that an educational system as it exists in the U.S.A. and the different culture under which the education takes place are the major reasons for the rules and restrictions which govern life in the women's dorms. Many of these rules and restrictions are necessary, although I often wonder why and why so many.

Should not a university student be old enough to be regulated more liberally, so that assumption of responsibility will rest mainly with the student herself? Generally I would say yes. The situation in most universities abroad is different, though.

Most students have had an education in high school that makes them feel much more responsible towards their study than students in the U.S.A. The main reasons are that they have to study much more and that the stress is not upon accumulation of credits and upon high grades but more upon the gathering of knowledge. This responsibility is carried

on into the university and is increased by the fact that most students financially depend upon their parents.

Furthermore, the campus-system does not exist in most universities abroad, while less girls attend the universities (are they not afraid they won't catch a man...?). Social life is not as intensive and most students do not have as much money to spend. The following remark of an American student may serve as illustration in contrasting educational systems: "Unfortunately I am so busy in getting an education that I won't be able to learn anything."

In his editorial S.V. talks about women and dormitories only. It is apparent that because the women are restricted, the men are restricted too. But what about the living organizations other than dormitories? Their regulations are often very strict too. I wonder whether a senior, who has to obey by all the rules set by the university and her living organization, will be able to face her responsibilities after her graduation, while she is not supposed to assume these at the university?

There are, for example, rules that result in a dead night if a girl dares to cut one or two of her classes. Even if she has low grades (does this always determine her interest and responsibility in her education?), I feel

that she should be able to decide for herself whether she can cut a class or not! Other regulations force students to study at certain hours of the day or, as S.V. pointed out, only at certain nights in the library.

These are just some examples. There are many more restrictions, many of them necessary because of the whole set-up of the educational system. Every educational system has, of course, its good and bad points. One step has already been taken (although forced) to improve the situation in Oregon through selecting people that want to go to the university.

Most international students realize the differences in the education and its bearings upon the rules and restrictions. They will note them as facts, although, indeed, they may sometimes wonder...

Jan Aarts
International Student from Holland, Senior in Business Administration

Emerald Editor:

We read with interest your editorial of February 18 on the subject of tax assessment, with its decided title "Unreasonable and Unfair." We wish to obtain certain amplifications of your statements on this subject.

The question as you put it was "whether fraternities, sororities, and co-ops are basically