

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
GLEN GRAVES, Ass't. Adv. Mgr.
EDITORIAL BOARD: Bill Mainwaring, Marcia Mauney, Sally Jo Greig, Sam Vahey, Jack Wilson, Al Johnson
 Chief Make-up Editor: Al Johnson
 Ass't. News Editor: Cay Mundorff, Joan Dennis, Nancy Castle, Evelyn Olsen, Nancy Ferguson
 Feature Editor: Phil Hager

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.

KEN NIEHANS, Business Manager
DOROTHY BARKER, Adv. Mgr.
CORNELIA FOGLE, News Editor
CHARMION FORD, Office Manager
CHUCK MITCHELMORE, Circulation Mgr.
SAM VAHEY, Asst. Sports Editor
JERRY RAMSEY, Tom Chapman, Executive Secretary
PAT HOLLEY, Copy Desk Chief
WAYNE WOODMAN

Was the 'Preview' Worthwhile?

We'll be criticized for "hurting their feelings when they tried so hard," but there are a number of things about Friday night's Vodvil Show which cannot be left unsaid. This performance was another unfortunately bad one in the history of the decline of the show as a once-top campus event.

The living group skits have gone steadily downhill in quality, the masters of ceremonies have not been good (this year's was just not capable of doing the job) and production of the show has been more and more sloppy (and here we mean both the lack of audio-visual coordination and the lag between the show's end and the trophy awarding).

The show has gone from a performance which we were proud to attend with the high school seniors to an event which now is not worthy of a Mac Court showing at four bits a head.

And this decline of character brings the event into serious question as to its value as a Duck Preview "highlight." If this is the type of entertainment which we are going to continue to dish out at lower and lower quality as the weekend's opening event, the success of the Preview itself may have a corresponding decline.

As for the weekend in general, we're pleased that the good caliber of the other

events might have made up for the opening showing. And this is fortunate, for the weekend is up for question right now as to practicability.

This may or may not be good news to present students, who regard the event alternately as the greatest rushing function of the year and the worst headache producer of the year. But the question is coming up as to just how much longer the Preview — at both Oregon and OSC — can be held (with or without a poor Vodvil). The weekends at both institutions are becoming more and more crowded and even a \$5 pre-registration fee this year did not cut the total appreciably.

Sooner or later the weekends may have to be cancelled due to the lack of housing for the seniors. How soon this may come and what will be done to replace the Previews may be decided at a meeting of the High School-College Relations Commission of the State System of Higher Education here this weekend.

We don't have room here to discuss the philosophy or even consider the worth of the weekend to the University, but if the low character of the Vodvil Show spreads to other events of the Preview, there won't be much question in our mind about the weekend's value. (C.H.M.)

Dainty Inferno



College Capers . . .

From Coast to Coast

(ACP)—Many college presidents have expressed concern about the tendency toward increasing student fees. One of them, President A. N. Jorgensen of the University of Connecticut thinks the nation's land grant colleges and state universities should be working fast at the job of making the word "free" apply to public education at their level.

At a meeting in Washington, Jorgensen said the pressure for student fees at state institutions "strikes right at the heart of the philosophy of

American public education." Jorgensen noted that back in 1948 a presidential committee recommended that college be made more nearly free. Then he went on to add, "We've been going in the opposite direction ever since. We can't keep on pyramiding the cost to youngsters or we'll be pricing education right out of the market."

Jorgensen said he thought students at public institutions should pay for the non-instructional costs, such as fees for extra-curricular activities. But he said that all instructional costs should be paid for from tax funds.

Similar opinions are held by nearly all the presidents of land grant institutions. A recent poll of 71 presidents showed all but two strongly opposed to increasing student fees.

In an interview in the Daily Campus, Jose Weizenblot, senior at University of Connecticut, expanded on his ideas about the American student's lack of concern over political affairs.

He blames it in part on the isolation of the campus: the American college is an entire community with newspaper, shopping district, religious and cultural elements and so many other things the student can simply exist in this separate world and ignore what surrounds it.

"Apart from specific organizations within the university, students fail to follow world affairs." He called the student senate a "bunch of children playing at toys, making trivia into major issues, getting nowhere when they discuss."

"In the event they do not decide upon a major issue," it makes little difference because "they have so little authority they probably would be unable to carry out their plan."

He contrasted this with the position of university students in Honduras. "There students have the dual role of acquiring a profession and also of preparing themselves for future leadership of their country."

"They are active in their civic role and are regarded as an important political factor in their country and therefore play a definite role in the political life of the nation."

+ + Letters to the Editor + +

Emerald Editor:

Why wasn't more discussion of the issues raised by the candidates' platforms included in the editor's endorsement of candidates for ASUO elections?

One candidate for president calls for a definite commitment by the administration as to its future plans and policies regarding support of segregated groups. The other candidate is silent on this particular aspect of the discrimination question. One candidate favors wage increases for students employed by University facilities. The other candidate has not shown he is aware of the problem.

One candidate favors increased representation for the special problems of married students. The other has offered nothing concrete here. Discussion of these matters could have filled the space the editor used "gossip-column" paragraphs.

Apparently, however, the editor thinks that pictures and not ideas win voter approval since one candidate's picture has appeared three times during the campaign and the other candidate's picture only once.

Ed Fadeley
 Third Year Law
 Student

Editor's Note:

Issues were not stressed because after several hours of discussion with both candidates, the editorial board felt there was little essential disagreement except on the fraternity discrimination question. The Emerald view on this matter is that the white clause is morally wrong but that discrimination

can be eliminated only by fraternities themselves. Lynch generally agrees with this view.

Emerald Editor:

Since the Oregon Student Party did not print an apology for their misleading flyer as we heard they were going to, we would like to state our position concerning the coming elections.

Two members of our house were at the Oregon Student Party meeting but they were not there as representatives of our chapter. We are not supporting the Oregon Student Party as a group. We prefer to vote as individuals, for individuals.

Beverly Laaksonen
 President,
 Sigma Kappa

Emerald Editor:

I want to make several comments regarding the use of my name in Monday's editorial. I am sorry to see you engage in a not-so-subtle attempt to discredit Kalberer by associating him with those of us among the graduate students in political science who have taken strong stands on racial and religious discriminatory clauses.

My interest in local politics centers on this one issue. Frankly, I do not believe that the OSP has taken strong enough a stand on this issue, or have hit hard enough at the fraternities who keep such clauses and an administration which simply "studies the matter."

I can also assure you that if I had been in charge of the cam-

paign I would have raised serious public objection to the Emerald's failure to relate to the public the fact that the Vice-President and a student voted 12 student body cards when in fact the election booth had closed.

I would also have objected to Emerald's pious mouthings about the criteria used to select the candidate they endorse. I made such suggestions to Dahlgren and certain party members but they refused in every case to engage in a campaign that would bring out these issues.

As a result I attended only two party meetings. Mr. Mainwaring, I would have been happy to have supplied you with such information if you had requested it. I know that you and I have had different opinions on many issues over the past years, and that my habit of pointing out your mistakes must be irritating.

It is not that I care a tinker's damn what you think of me or my opinions on anything, but I do resent your crude and obvious attempt to grind your own political ax on campus by the use of my name.

Also I trust that if you have any other questions about my relation to anything else that takes place on this campus you will ask me about it before you put my name in print.

George M. Boyet
 Graduate Student
 in Political Science

Emerald Editor:

I believe that I am entitled

to make a few remarks with respect to the current student political campaign inasmuch as I was honored by being mentioned in Monday's editorial and the implication of that editorial that I, among others, regard this election as "merely a game."

First, you give me too much credit. I carefully avoided having anything to do with writing the OSP platform or the selection of the candidates of the party. I did briefly visit the second of the many party meetings. On the other hand, I was pleased to see the strong platform that the party hammered out in open meetings. I have met Kalberer, I like him, and I am convinced that he would make an excellent president of our student body.

On several occasions I offered the party managers my advice, some of it at the top of my voice. But when I was told that an old graduate student is out of touch with general student sentiment, I had to admit it was probably true.

Second, I admit that I like politics, and that we sometime treat it as if it were a game. When there are no issues, it is a game. However, when there are issues raised of such importance as discriminatory clauses, I try to find a humorous side to keep from crying out in anguish. That the OSP was willing to take up this issue in such a forthright manner was nothing short of heroic.

I knew as well as anyone that it was politically an inexpedient thing to do; an impossible bur-

(Continued on page 3)