

They Bear Watching

To our readily apparent preference in the race for the roses we would like to add our not-quite-impartial choice in the battle of the bands. We've been watching these Saturday extravaganzas for several years now, and we're happy to see that the football Oregons are picking up the long-established habit of the musical Oregons in outplaying the opposition.

Our attention was especially drawn to the Oregon marching band earlier this year when we read of Oregon State's troubles in getting enough of a turnout to field a marching group at all. Our attention was more than justified.

The Oregon marching band is small by comparison with others in the nation and even on the coast, but it certainly does not lack in spirit or quality what it may miss in size. Although we have had occasion to be disappointed with the band, it was only because we didn't have its services—at special pep rallies or pre-game stunts.

When (and if, by the grace of Washington, USC and Oregon State) our half-time legions pair off against some precision delegation from the mid-west next January, we're certain we'll not be ashamed. The men with the cleats on their shoes aren't the only ones with uniforms who bear watching out on that stadium turf.

Cruelty or Science?

The peculiar nature of humans is nicely pointed up by the storm of indignant protest that has arisen over the Russians' launching of a small dog in Sputnik II. The repercussions of this act may well catch them with their propaganda down.

This is really—much as we hate to admit it—another scientific “first” for the Russians. They beat us with Sputnik I and now have launched a larger satellite with a warm-blooded animal in it.

Many observers are saying, and perhaps correctly, that sending Curly up with the new satellite will do the Russians much more harm—propaganda-wise—than good.

This follows the old journalistic axiom that a picture of a starving pup on a back page will arouse more interest and discussion than a dozen stormy editorials.

Perhaps the “inhumane act” will be identified with some of the past barbarous actions of the Soviets. We can hope, from a propaganda standpoint, that this will be the case.

But from a detached scientific viewpoint, the storm of indignant protest over Curly is nonsense, and made even more ridiculous by some animal-lovers' suggestions that human volunteers should have been sent up instead. Much of scientific value can be learned by sending a mammal orbiting in space.

Russian scientists will be able to learn how a body reacts to space travel from little Curly. Radio signals are sending back data on her blood pressure, heartbeat and breathing. All this can be applied when man decides to fly into space. And current thinking and experiments—American and Russian—are certainly with this end in view. If this information is shared with western scientists, we stand to learn much from the experiment.

Animals have been used for scientific purposes for a long time. American scientists have used farm animals in atomic tests, such as those at Bikini atoll. We have sent rats, mice and monkeys up in high-altitude balloons and rockets to certain death for scientific purposes. A definite scientific end was served and no one complained.

Most of the modern advances in medical science have been over the dead bodies of thousands of laboratory rabbits and guinea pigs. Many of the techniques of treating heart disease have been perfected through experiments on dogs.

The Emerald certainly does not condone needless inhumanity toward dumb animals. But we hold no brief with those emotional people who are saying that animals should not be used in legitimate scientific experiments. And just because the Russians are using Curly in a scientific experiment does not change the facts of the matter. We're just sorry that she's not up in an American Vanguard.

Pipeline Under the Dry Zone?



"I UNDERSTAND TH' SIGNA PHI NOthings ARE A BUNCH OF 'PARTY' BOYS."

William Cook

NLRB Decision May Worry Apathetic Union Members

The rank-and-file International Brotherhood of Teamsters' members who have justified the corrupt activities of Dave Beck and his underlings because they, at the same time, have “advanced the labor movement,” must now be doing some wondering. For the National Labor Relations Board last Friday handed down an unanimous decision that five Portland teamster units have committed numerous and serious unfair employer practices.

The decision ordered the teamsters to recognize Local 11 of the Office Employees International as the bargaining agent for Portland teamster office workers.

The NLRB found that the teamsters' violations against their own employees in Portland included refusal to bargain collectively, threats of economic reprisals and attempts to induce its employees who were witnesses at NLRB hearings to change their testimony or not appear at all on threat of being fired.

The Oregonian reported that the charge of coercing witnesses was the first such violation in more than 20 years with the NLRB.

The NLRB decision climaxed a four-year fight by the office employees local in Portland to organize teamster employees. The U.S. Supreme Court ordered the NLRB last May to take jurisdiction it had previously refused in the case when the Portland office workers asked the Court: “When labor unions are employers, do they have the right to commit unfair labor practices when business employees must obey the laws?”

Unfair employer practices is not limited to the Portland teamsters. Victor Riesel reported in his column Saturday that Dave Beck, teamster president, has refused to allow 80 office girls in the teamsters' Seattle headquarters to organize.

Office employees local 2 had tried to organize the girls, but Beck, in a most un-union-like

manner, “did what other labor chiefs have excoriated businessmen for doing,” Riesel said. “Beck called in the girls one by one. He warned them not to join the office employees union. He instead urged them to join a company union—the teamsters, who are the employers in this case.”

Beck also offered the girls numerous “fringe benefits” if they would join the teamsters. And when OEI president, Howard Coughlin, called on Beck, the teamster chief urged that the OEI merge with the teamsters, Riesel reported.

“This of course was unsatisfactory to Coughlin, so Beck ended their five-minute conference simply. ‘Good-bye,’ he said. So the Seattle teamster employees still have no union of their own choosing.

This all shows that the teamster leaders are committing gross hypocrisy, to say nothing of corrupt activities. Elected to positions of responsibility to further the working man's cause, they are in fact subverting the ideals and goals of the labor movement and robbing their union members in the process.

Union leaders of the Beck-Hoffa stripe are the labor movement's worst enemies. They are a product of apathetic union memberships who evidently feel their major battles to secure the rights and economic well-being of the working man have already been won.

But these apathetic union members may be wrong. They may have to fight labor's battles all over again. Only next time they won't be battling against businessmen and anti-labor sentiment. They'll be taking on their own leaders.

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
GARY CAPPS, Business Manager
JACK WILSON, Editorial Page Editor
ALLEN JOHNSON, Managing Editor
GLEN GRAVES, Advertising Manager
CORNELIA FOGLE, WILLIAM COOK, Associate Editors

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Emerald Editor:

During the Senate interviews for senator-at-large, the successful candidate made these remarks:

“The senate does not represent student opinion.”

“In most matters treated by the senate popular will is not in question.”

I believe these are true in this and most ‘student governments.’ The questions I would like to throw out to the student body are these. What does the senate represent, and what should it represent? What does student government do that justifies its existence and student nature?

Because I am somewhat prejudiced, having lost out in the above mentioned interviews, and because my ideas have been declared unoriginal on the basis of their having been already expressed, I shall offer only one thought to start things moving. Student government stands in constant danger of becoming nothing more than a conciliatory agency between the students and the administration.

There are two things that make this possible. One is the superabundance of time-consuming activities which leave little time for evaluation. The other is the “experienced” ingroup that develops where only certain freshmen have the right connections in this same array of all campus activities. This clique

develops a set of values different from that of the campus as a whole, yet because of their ‘experience’ these are the ones who swing elections and perpetuate themselves. I believe this is basically an unhealthy situation and deserves serious thought. Are there any ideas?

Gerry Brown,
Junior in Psych.

Emerald Editor:

The time has finally come when we can sit back and, without reservation, gaze with pride and admiration upon our conference-leading Webfoots. We can cheer and shout in their behalf (and ours), and we can rally and otherwise display our approval. This is all well and good, and I think we should continue to do so.

However, there is a possibility that many of us may overlook the most important part of it. I think there is an important lesson to be learned by us all from Coach Len Casanova and his Webfoots.

Oregon has had many football heroes in the past few years, having proved themselves here and after leaving. But never have I seen the hero of a football campaign emerge as the whole team.

The present team is made up of outstanding ballplayers, true, but these same ballplayers beat their brains out fruitlessly last

year trying to win. What has changed? For the main, they're the same individuals. They're under the same coaches. They were again picked by the “experts” to finish low in the PCC. What's the difference between this team and last year's?

I don't claim to know the whole answer, nor if what I contend is a cause rather than an effect, but I do say there's something here from which we can all learn a thing or two: The Ducks are operating solely as a team (by this I mean much more completely than I've ever seen in the past). They've shown us, right before our own eyes, what they, what WE, and what any other group, for that matter, can do when united and working toward a common objective. We've all heard this said many times, of course, and it sounds corny to repeat it. But right now a rare opportunity lies before us; our football team is a splendid example of this doctrine.

Together, we as loyal sons and daughters, can build Oregon to the heights to which men like O. Meredith Wilson, Willard Thompson, Bass Dyer, and so many others are so devoted; an institution to which we can all look back upon with heart-felt admiration, deep respect and true pride.

Further, together we as citi-

(Continued on page 3)