

Two Speakers, Two Philosophies

Two political philosophies will be aired on campus this afternoon — as well-qualified exponents of two national parties speak separately on a key question of the day, civil rights.

Oregon's junior Senator, Richard L. Neuberger, will appear at the regular 1 p.m. assembly in the Student Union. His announced topic is "Civil Rights."

Socialist Youth League secretary Bogdan Denitch will speak on "The Failure of Liberals on Civil Liberties" at the 4 p.m. coffee hour, also in the Student Union.

Neuberger's name is well-known at the University. The Senator was a former editor of The Emerald and graduated from the school of journalism. His fame has spread nationally through his writings and his service in the Senate.

Denitch, on the other hand, comes to Eugene relatively unknown politically. He has helped organize youth socialist leagues for many years in New York state.

Curiously, Denitch is here with the avowed purpose of arousing interest in the socialist movement—a trend which has been generally connoted in the United States as unfavorable to the traditional ideal of free enterprise.

Critics of Neuberger have leveled charges of socialism at the Senator. The appearance of Denitch should offer some interesting comparisons between a so-called socialist and a declared socialist.

The value of such appearances cannot be overestimated, though it is undoubtedly true that meager turnouts will hear both speakers. The talks are another forward step in a progressive policy of inviting prominent guests from all areas.

This is still another opportunity to obtain education outside the more familiar haunts of the classroom, the study room of the library. Face to face listening to the words of Neuberger and Denitch should help compound student opinions in the mystic world of political belief.

+ + +

The Tune Changes

As we had suspected all along, the flamboyant professional press of Los Angeles doesn't exactly give us the complete picture of public opinion on athletics. If Chuck Fenton's editorial in the UCLA Daily Bruin is any indication, there are some red faces in the southland over the latest result of the high-powered press campaign to clear UCLA and USC:

When will the state start spending money on worthwhile athletic functions? Two years ago the state assemblymen investigated boxing. Some good was done, but one man, promoter Cal Eaton of the Los Angeles Olympic Auditorium, was found to have paid \$10,000 too much in back taxes.

Once more investigators have taken off on a new athletic cause. Only last week, a special assembly investigating committee spent three

factless-finding days of pring into past Pacific Coast Conference action.

Finding out nothing more than the known facts that UCLA Athletic Director Wilbur Johns was asked about the terms of Coach Red Sanders' contract, these politicians decided to take the case to further debate in San Francisco...

A suggestion should be forwarded to the California State Assembly. As long as you men are so interested in probing athletics, why don't you find out why UCLA does not have a basketball pavilion or why the city of Los Angeles has delayed the building of a civic arena?...

Admittedly, the point of Fenton's editorial was a complaint against wasteful spending of taxpayers' money, rather than a moralistic examination of the reasons behind the investigation.

But it is a breath of fresh air compared to what usually passes for comment on the athletic scene in the Los Angeles press.

+ + +

Our Contemporaries: Writer Attacks Smugness of Ivy League Schools

(ACP)—From the editorial page of The Holcad, Westminster college, New Wilmington, Pa., comes this comment on two kinds of colleges.

What a surprise it was to read in Holiday that the Ivy league schools, "dedicated to pure and remote knowledge," are a thing of the past; "The Big Ten will have the future."

Hitting Ivy education, Professor Paul Engle of the University of Iowa writes, "The Ivy League's smallness depends on the Big Ten's bigness. Never forget; the Big Ten is that

massive wall to which that gracious ivy clings."

Such universities as Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa and Illinois have none of the conformity that makes an "Ivy league campus look as if its students had all gone to the same prep school at Conformity Corners."

Professor Engle does say Ivy is supreme in the limited area of undergraduate education, "But under the conception that the whole state is the campus, the Big Ten is supreme."

The author should be con-

gratulated on his attack at the smugness of the Ivy league schools. Living off the fame and traditions of a past era, these vine-covered halls of learning have shunned the possibilities of a good education at any other college. The Harvard, Yale or Princeton diploma has been glorified erroneously as the ultimate in education.

The author does stick his neck out a bit far, however, in predicting an end for the Eastern schools. Schools like Yale who can only take one fourth of their applicants and Dartmouth, which chooses its freshman class of 725 from 6,000 applicants will continue to get the best potential college material. Schools in the Big Ten are required to take the mediocre student as well as the intelligent one because they are tax-supported.

For Professor Engle to assert that "education for the few, dedicated to pure and remote knowledge is fine, touching and doomed" certainly predicts an end for liberal education as a whole.

And yet, it was Alfred P. Sloan, of General Motors, who said, "Give us educated men. We can train them ourselves. But we can't educate them."

Not Today, We Hope



"GOOD GRIEF WE'LL NEVER GET A SEAT—I FORGOT ASSEMBLY THIS PERIOD."

William Cook

Red ICBM, Miniature Moon Should Cause Sleeplessness

The Soviet satellite now circling the earth caught the



United States completely by surprise. Little did we imagine that the "backward" Russians were so advanced in the deadly science of rocketry.

The United States Defense department, which is working on our earth satellite, set next spring as the tentative date for launching our man-made "moon." This date is considerably later than was originally planned.

The Soviets, who also had announced they were working on an earth satellite, did not set a specific date for their launching nor did they tell much of their projected satellite. They simply waited until it was orbiting the earth before saying very much about it.

The Soviets have also announced they have successfully fired a 5,000 mile inter-continental ballistic missile. The official pooh-pooh of this announcement will doubtless now get an official re-evaluation.

The combination of these two announcements, and the definite confirmation of one, will cause some sleepless nights for those concerned with our satellite and ICBM programs.

The immediate effect of the Soviet satellite is prestige for the Russian scientists and technicians. Congratulations from many nations have poured into the Soviet International Geophysical Year headquarters.

By contrast, the United States has been bally-hooing its projected satellite for many months. Yet we are still far from ready to actually launch our satellite. Our propaganda makes the Soviet satellite announcement stand out in bold relief and has boosted Red prestige throughout the world.

From a military standpoint, the launching of the Soviet satellite is indeed disturbing. The missile was shot by a rocket to an altitude of 560 miles, and sent circling the globe at 18,000 miles an hour. This altitude is higher than any of our missiles have reached. The Soviet satellite itself weighs 185 pounds—

nearly nine times the weight of our "moon."

These facts indicate the technological and scientific strides the Soviets have made in rocketry. They indicate that the perplexing problems of controlling the path of huge multi-stage rockets have been, to a degree at least, solved by the Russians. They indicate the power which the Soviet rockets can generate to push their relatively huge satellite out into space.

The conclusion some American scientists have drawn is that the Russians used their newly-claimed ICBM to propel their satellite into space. This conclusion lends credence to the Soviet ICBM claim.

The question which plagues most Americans is why we lagged behind the Russians in satellite development. Our pride has been hurt; we are chagrined at the thought that the USSR has beaten us in a field where we feel superior—technological advancement.

One nationally known physicist working on our missile program blames "politics" for our failure to launch a satellite first. E. P. Martz, Jr., said that inter-service rivalry, combined with a lack of understanding by persons in high office threw stumbling blocks in the way of American scientists.

Martz charged that presidential advisors regarded the satellite program as a "little experiment" and complained that it was running over its budget of \$20 million. This attitude, if accurate, is not uncommon among government officials toward research projects not directly related to the military.

The Russians, on the other hand, put a "crash" priority on their satellite program. That this paid off for them is evident. Throughout the world, the opinion that Russia may be seriously rivaling the United States in modern arms is being voiced. And this is due to the success of Russia's "little experiment."

The effect the Soviet satellite will have on our missile and satellite programs is yet to be seen. But it's almost certain the Defense department will call for a "crash" priority on satellite development. More important, our missile program, al-

(Continued on page 3)

OREGON DAILY EMERALD

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published four times in September and five days a week during the school year, except during examination and vacation periods, by the Student Publications Board of the University of Oregon. Entered as second class matter at the post office, Eugene, Oregon. Subscription rates: \$5 per 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.

CHARLES MITCHELMORE, Editor
JACK WILSON, Editorial Page Editor
GARY CAPPS, Business Manager
ALLEN JOHNSON, Managing Editor
GLEN GRAVES, Advertising Manager
CORNELIA FOGLE, WILLIAM COOK, Associate Editors
PHIL HAGER, News Editor
JOANNE MILLIGAN, Ass't Bus. Mgr.
ROGER CAFFEY, Circulation Manager
JERRY RAMSEY, Sports Editor

EDITORIAL BOARD: Charles Mitchelmore, Jack Wilson, Allen Johnson, Cornelia Fogle, William Cook, Phil Hager, Jerry Ramsey, Wayne Woodman.

Make-up Editor: Wayne Woodman
Day Editors: Joan Kraus, Evelyn Olsen, Pepper Allen, Mike Forrester, Pat Trece.
Office Manager: Alice McKendree
Nat'l Adv. Mgr.: Joanne Milligan
Executive Secretary: Pat Holley
Chief Photographer: Nathan Bull

Women's Editor: Kathy Cook
Night Editors: Ron Robinson, Dave Lortie, Frank Ingram.