

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
CHUCK MITCHELMORE, Managing Editor
DOROTHY BARKER, Adv. Mgr.
SALLY JO GREIG, SAM VAHEY, Associate Editors
KEN NIEHANS, Business Manager
CORNELIA FOGLE, News Editor

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.

If Desirable in Principle, What Then?

"Three rally squads in a year." That's the disgusted comment of many after hearing about the ASUO Cabinet's recommendation to select new rally squads in spring term, rather than between football and basketball seasons.

This was a recommendation, and nothing more. It was made rather hastily. No action has yet taken place. The ASUO Senate will consider the recommendation Thursday night, and probably delay the decision pending more investigation.

The fact that such a recommendation was passed by the Cabinet without dissent, however, certainly is significant. Perhaps the decision was the outgrowth of a general dissatisfaction with school spirit which has existed for several years.

The Cabinet had been debating the pros and cons of popular election of the Yell King, a proposal that has recently been receiving some support from various sources. Opinion was strongly divided except that all agreed that rally things in general are far from perfect, just as they have been for years. Everyone is seeking a miracle to make things sweetness and light.

Shirley McLean, a former rally squad member, suggested that one definite improvement would be the selection of the Yell King, Rally Board and rally squad in spring term. The present system, which was adopted as an experiment, had not proved a good one, she felt. Everyone agreed that a changeover between football and basketball seasons was expecting too much of the squad and an invitation to confusion.

There was nothing personal in the deci-

sion, unless it could be inferred that Cabinet members do not consider the present rally squad the needed miracle. They merely thought that in principle spring term selection would be preferable.

What is true in principle, however, is often not easy to apply. Would it be fair to present rally squad members to remove them after basketball season, after they had been selected to perform for a full year? They have spent much money for their uniforms, and have worked hard on their routines. Rewarding them by a mass firing would cause hard feelings all around. And it certainly wouldn't improve the prestige of these positions, which we feel is badly needed, especially in the case of the men.

Another possibility would be to lengthen the terms of the present squad to include next basketball season, making the next selection in the spring of 1958. This would still accomplish the main purpose, which is to set up a spring term selection system which would give new squads plenty of time to organize before they perform.

This decision deserves a lot of thought. If the change is desirable in principle, should it be made this spring or next spring?

Footnotes

We ignored the backward Z in the SU Ballroom "Dad's Daze" sign, but this one is just too much. Boys, there is just no such word as WebFEET — not in the whole court of McArthur, city of Eugene, county of Lane or state of Oregon. So please, let's "Go You WebFOOTS!" huh?

— Letters to the Editor —

Emerald Editor:

We feel that in order to alleviate the confusion, rush, and hard feelings which inevitably occur on registration day, registration material should be distributed by some other system than the one now in use. After all, is it necessary for students to mob each other just for a packet of cards? Surely there is some other solution.

Couldn't the material be mailed to the students ahead of time so the cards could be filled out in a civilized and legible manner, or perhaps they could be picked up on Sunday afternoon prior to registration?

Whatever the resolution of this problem, it could only be for the better.

Pat Treece
Freshman in Journalism
Jeanne Wells
Freshman in Spanish

Emerald Editor:

Had I not been present in McArthur court at Friday night's basketball game and heard it for myself, I would never have believed that the walls of that hallowed arena would resound with the shouts of "Go you Webfeet" or any other yell which made a perverted use of the revered name, "Webfoots."

Although the exact origin of the name "Webfoots" is not definitely known, it has been used to describe University of Oregon athletic teams for al-

most as many years as we have had teams competing.

Many has been the out-of-stater who questioned the grammatical propriety of the term, but through the years it has remained a nickname dear to the hearts of Oregonians, and there seems little chance it will be dispelled in favor of the more refined but less colorful "Webfeet."

I hasten to point out, however, that there is apparent danger within the ranks of Oregon rooters themselves which unless checked may have serious consequences. Think, for example, of the wrong impression that may be left with the thousands of persons outside this state who tune in to a regional sportcast and hear "Webfeet" being shouted by the Oregon students.

Or think of how many freshmen and other new students are going to be led astray by the use of this word corruption. If the word "Webfeet" continues to be used in derogation of "Webfoots," it may in time sound the death-knell of a renowned idiom.

The Oregon yell squad should be recalled from office or else forced to recite 100 times during halftime of the Oregon State game, "Go you Webfoots."

Bill Frye
Eugene Attorney
Class of '53

Emerald Editor:

We, the undersigned, congratulate you on your fine article "We Question Women's Dorm Regulations." We are anxiously awaiting the sequence on these regulations which you have promised to publish. We sincerely hope that these articles influence a change in the established regulations.

62 Signatures on File

Emerald Editor:

Dad's Weekend has come and gone once again. This year more dads than ever before were on campus, and it looks to us as if it was a success. We hope it was, and that the students and dads alike enjoyed the whole weekend.

We enjoyed working on Dad's Weekend and we especially are proud of our committee heads and their committees. They functioned well and spent lots of time and energy in their work, the results of which were quite obvious. We feel sure that they were well rewarded for their hard work by seeing so many dads here.

We commend the students, too, for encouraging their dads to visit the campus for Dad's Weekend.

Nancy Taylor
Fred Nunn
Co-Chairmen,
1957 Dad's Weekend

The Morning After



"FRANKLY I'D RATHER ADVISE FRESHMEN — THEY'RE NOT SO SET IN THEIR WAYS."

Interpreting the News

Mollet, Ike to Patch Up Split over Attack on Egypt

By JAMES MARLOW
AP News Analyst

WASHINGTON (AP) — The United States and France were as close as a pair of pants until they split over the French attack on Egypt last November. The pants have badly needed mending ever since.

So when President Eisenhower and French Premier Guy Mollet meet tomorrow — the first such meeting since the invasion of Egypt — it will be like a couple of tailors sewing on a patch.

And the result, like any good patch, will probably be satisfactory but unsensational.

Mollet was premier when the attack was made. It was a combined French-British assault, arranged by Mollet with the then British Prime Minister Eden. It was also one of the clumsiest fumbles in French-British history.

The White House was equally mad at both men for the attack which infuriated the Arab world just when the United States was extremely anxious to keep the Arabs friendly to the West and away from Russia.

Eisenhower and the United Nations put pressure on the British and French to stop the shooting. Both did and left Egypt. But the independent French-British action caused the first postwar bustup among the three big allies.

Mollet and Eden very quickly wanted to come here and see Eisenhower to get things straightened out. That kind of reconciliation so soon wouldn't have looked good to the Arabs. Eisenhower gave the two prime ministers a cold shoulder.

Not so Mollet, a dry, professional, colorless French politician. Reports from Paris say the French, even though dismayed by the willingness of their government to back out of Egypt so fast, admired Mollet for his daring in fighting at all.

But the rift between this country and its two allies could not be permitted to go on in-

definitely. And Eisenhower, after talking things over with Mollet, will visit with Eden's successor, Prime Minister Harold Macmillan.

What sometimes gets lost sight of in concern over the American-British-French split was why the British and French, who had worked hand-in-glove with this country, had attacked Egypt on their own without telling the United States.

Eden and Mollet were sore at the way Secretary of State Dulles had handled Egyptian President Nasser's seizure of the Suez Canal. The British and French didn't want to let Nasser get away with it.

Dulles offered some plans for dealing with Nasser. None of them worked. They used up time. And they left Nasser in undisputed possession of the canal. Eden and Mollet didn't want any more of Dulles' delays. So they struck.

But the United States and its allies need each other too much in standing off communism to go their separate ways.

However, neither the British nor the French have been in sympathy with Eisenhower and Dulles on their handling of Israel, which also attacked Egypt.

Eisenhower and Dulles have been talking vaguely about imposing sanctions on the Israelis for refusing to leave Egyptian territory until they get guarantees from the United States or the United Nations — that, once they pull back, Nasser won't be allowed to attack them, as he did in the past.

Mollet and Eisenhower will have to mull over that difference. But, aside from that, there are no basic quarrels between this country and its allies. All three are still partners.

One result of the French-British decision to go it alone in invading Egypt may be to make Dulles and Eisenhower a little more careful to listen to the British and French when they think, as in the case of the Suez, their vital interests are at stake.

By the same token they'll probably think twice about getting into a war the next time without telling this country or getting its support.