

Tradition Time Again

A Black-Edged Tradition

A little more than a year ago, Oregon State's Beavers were roaring with all due haste towards the Pacific Coast football championship, an honor they eventually received. With three straight league wins, they met the Washington Huskies halfway, at Portland, and were happy to pull out a 28-20 victory.

After this, Oregon State edged Stanford and Idaho, was tied by Oregon, and wound up in the Rose Bowl New Year's Day.

And tomorrow afternoon, in Multnomah Stadium, the curtain goes up on a very similar stage: Oregon's number-one Ducks meet these same pesky Huskies in the midst of their pennant drive. The Ducks are after their first PCC crown in nine years, but like OSC last year, they have to get past Washington first.

A searching look at the UO-Husky record book should tell you something of significance—the best index of an Oregon team's strength is their annual meeting with Washington. Let there be no doubt about this: the Oregon-Washington series, begun in 1900, reads like a barometer of Webfoot success, or lack of same.

If you want examples: Oregon's three modern Coast titlists, in 1919, 1933 and 1948, all got past the Huskies en route to their crown. But take a look at the long

years in between. Take last year, when a fumbling but highly regarded Duck crew fell 27-6 at Seattle, or 1955, when a 19-7 early-season loss to the Huskies seemed to start them on an up-and-down trend for the rest of the year.

Maybe it reduces to this: no matter how potent the Webfoots have been in preceding games, they simply have to fight for every offensive inch against Washington, even with a 5-0 record and a game or two away from the PCC title, they must overcome a black-edged postwar tradition come Saturday (three UO wins since 1945—1947, 1948 and 1954.)

They tell us that when a team, like Oregon, is in the thick of a victory drive, each up-coming game looms larger than the last, no matter who the opponent. Washington, carrying only a one-three PCC record, looks at first glance small potatoes for the on-rushing Ducks. We don't think they'll be so easy. Len Casanova and his team don't think so either.

But neither do we think that the Huskies, with all their traditions, will keep Oregon from advancing another big step towards that PCC crown. Meet you at S.W. 18th between Taylor and Salmon if you're interested in seeing the Ducks take that step.



Letters to the Editor

Emerald Editor:

There appeared in the Oregon Daily Emerald on Wednesday, November 6, 1957 in the column written by Wynn Dahlgren an article entitled, "Implications of Amendment Unclear to Many Students." I would like to add that it appears to me the amendment is not only unclear in the writer's mind, itself, but he has misinterpreted several points discussed in his column.

The first objection to the proposed amendment that Mr. Dahlgren expressed was to the listing of the presidential candidates twice, once on the ballot for president and once on the ballot for senator-at-large.

And Mr. Dahlgren asserted: "In order to assure a candidate's election to the Senate, a voter would have to vote for the same candidate on both ballots." This is absurd. The only assurance of a candidate's election depends on whether at least fifty per cent of the other voters vote the same way as you did.

Evidently the writer possesses the idea that one vote for both offices equals assurance of election. But the purpose behind this proposal lay in the idea that perhaps some candidates running for president would be to some voters of senatorial caliber, and not presidential; and that valuable men would not be lost to the Senate even though he lose out in the presidential election.

Furthermore, he stated that "the presidential candidates are listed in alphabetical order at the top of the senator-at-large ballot." I am afraid that the writer failed to clarify this point to this reader, in that presidential candidates listed on the senator-at-large ballot will be in regular alphabetical order with the rest of the senator candidates.

And the obvious question to me is—why not have two ballots? The essence of the amendment lies in that a presidential candidate, although a candidate also for senator, does not have the benefit of those ballots that he received for president as he now does under the present constitution; but he must start anew with the other senator candidates and garner only senator votes to win in this capacity.

I fail to see Mr. Dahlgren's point in his so-called "preferred listing" that a presidential candidate receives. The absolute assurance of nine senior senators, under this proposal is

equally ridiculous, because of no preferred alphabetical listing. "Name familiarity" can apply to juniors and sophomores, as well as seniors.

But Mr. Dahlgren, I think, has made the gravest mistake in his interpretation and analysis in his stand for the plurality system of election as opposed to the majority system of presidential election. This stand can only be attributed to his apparent misunderstanding of the preferential voting system.

Let's use his own hypothetical voting situation, and I quote: "Candidate A gets 700 first place votes, B gets 650, C gets 600, D gets 570, and E gets 500. Under the present plurality system, A is elected." A total of 3020 votes have been cast, and A is elected with 700. This means that we have a President elected by less than 1/4 the total voters!

In other words, a total of 2320 voters would have absolutely no say in who they elected for president. How about that! Under the majority system as proposed by the ensuing constitutional amendment, at least fifty per cent plus one would be necessary to elect a president. This seems to be much better representation than can be obtained under the plurality system.

Yes, and very possibly C or D could win the election, but this is not a third or fourth choice president as Mr. Dahlgren claims. On the contrary they would have gained a majority, mostly made up of number one and number two votes. Is a candidate a third or fourth choice, if he attains a majority of votes through the transfer of ballots? Assuredly not.

His picture of chaos and confusion in the counting of the ballots can only be found in his own understanding of the preferential system.

Bud Titus
Junior in Pre-law

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 GRAYES, Advertising Manager
CORNELIA FOGLE, **WILLIAM COOK**, Associate Editors

A Costly Lesson

From the spate of recent news stories about American missile and satellite developments, the impression is gained that we have suddenly speeded up these programs. Every day for the past five weeks we have been treated to ever-increasing details about American missiles and satellites.

Certainly, we say, at this rate the United States will soon close the apparent gap between our missile program and that of the Russians.

Unfortunately, the situation is not as it appears to the casual observer. Our missile and satellite programs since the launching of Russia's Sputniks have progressed little faster than before. The difference is that we, the public and the public's press, are finally, at long last, getting an official look at our missile programs.

Russia's spectacular success with its Sputniks has been greeted in this country with an almost hysterical public clamor to equal Russian scientific and military feats. We had been led to believe that we were well ahead—or at least on a par—in the missile race. What else could we believe? High government officials like Charles Wilson, ex-defense department secretary, told us so, and at the same time released little specific information and refused to allow the press the opportunity to see for themselves.

Information about the missile programs was largely gleaned by the press from unofficial sources and vaguely worded news releases. At times, the defense department or one of its military services had denied that missiles had been fired when the test had been observed and photographed.

One of the reason for this excessive secrecy can be traced to the method the defense department is employing in missile development. Each military service has been given specific kinds of missiles to develop. Since these assignments often overlap, the individual services have tried to keep their missile project results from the other two. This inter-service rivalry has helped cause not only the secrecy, but the lag in American missile development, for their indi-

vidual research and development programs were not pooled.

The defense department recently acknowledged the existence of a long-range radar net with which it is possible to "observe" the Russians testing long-range missiles. With the intelligence gained from this radar net, the defense department certainly was not unaware that the Russians have been testing high-powered rockets for some time.

Yet when the Russians announced that they had successfully tested an intercontinental ballistic missile, it received an official pooh-pooh. Shortly thereafter, the Sputniks proved the official appraisals wrong. Satellites of their weight require an ICBM-size rocket to shoot them into their orbits.

It is true that a certain amount of secrecy is necessary in military research and testing of this importance. But this need only be secrecy as to the technical aspects of the rockets and satellites, not secrecy as to the status and extent of our missile programs.

The defense department and its military services should have learned a valuable lesson from the uncomfortable position in which they find themselves. They had forgotten the existence of and importance of public opinion in a free nation. They had forgotten that when they spend \$5 billion a year to provide new weapons vital for the protection of the nation, the public has a right to know how—and how effectively—their money is being spent. This is a costly lesson for the defense department to learn. We hope they have not learned it too late.

Footnotes

Overheard in Student Union fishbowl during usual glut of 10 o'clock coffee drinkers: "Well, they certainly get a good cross-section of students in here, don't they?"

* * *

We understand that a floor-full of dormitory women recently picked up some "dead nights" for counting an unofficial cadence for the Thursday afternoon "troops." That's funny. Women have been counting cadence for men for centuries now—and they're still getting away with it.