

RE Week

Each year Religious Emphasis Week is included in an activity-packed term. And, often as not, RE Week is faced with a lack of student interest—the indifference which seems to mark so many modern students when questions of real importance are discussed. Conformity and apathy reign throughout the year on campus. These attitudes also lap over into our religious thinking.

Why an RE Week anyway? Why should we take pains to pay attention to another week of special lectures, meetings and discussions? What is so significant about this annual event which begins Sunday?

The name of RE Week is actually misleading. It's purpose is not so much to "emphasize" religion as it is to "evaluate" religion and relate it to the individual and to aspects of our society—this year specifically to "love and marriage." With such a topic, even those students who have formed definite ideas and attitudes about religion stand to gain something from the week's events. Few Oregon students do not plan to someday marry. This week's speakers promise to offer some valuable comments for both the married 24 per cent and the "free" three-fourths of the student body.

The speakers this year are especially good. Paul Popenoe, who is founder and director of the American Institute of Family Relations, is widely known as an expert on the institution of marriage. Though not a minister himself, Popenoe is well-qualified to speak on religious as well as other aspects of marriage. James Peterson, a University of Southern California sociology professor, served as a pastor before turning his attention more specifically to the problems of marriage education. He has offered his marriage-counseling services to students without charge during RE Week.

Through the firesides, personal conferences and Coffee Hour Forums, students will have an opportunity to discuss with the speakers and among themselves the more religious questions which may concern them.

RE Week can be of real value to students who take a little time out to avail themselves of some of the many events scheduled.

Back in Business

The carless "pigger is" back in business. The man who has been forced to walk his girl downtown and back or borrow a car for an evening's entertainment now has a new lease on life, thanks to the re-opening of the Mayflower Theatre.

This is an event that will be hailed by all old-timers (juniors and seniors) as the best news of the year. Underclassmen will wonder why for a while, but it'll take only one showing of "Oedipus Rex" to convince them that they've been missing out.

Two things made the Mayflower (located conveniently between Hilyard and Alder on 11th) an outstanding campus movie house before it closed its doors two years ago. Its location made it the ideal place to take a girl if wheeled transportation was not available. And the pictures it presented are exactly what every cultured college student enjoys, or is supposed to enjoy.

The Mayflower opens next Wednesday for a special two-day showing of "Oedipus Rex" and will then launch a regular Friday-Saturday-Sunday schedule of foreign films and Hollywood re-runs. The films are usually good, the price is right, and the distance couldn't be better.

Guess we can sell that old car now!

Harsh Words

Dr. Walter Orr Roberts, director of Colorado University's high altitude observatory, apparently isn't a man to mince words. He proved his point recently by casually remarking that four of every five students at CU should be sent home.

"I wish we had the guts to flunk out promptly all the kids who are no good," he said. "It should be difficult for a student to stay here. As we're now constituted, we should send about 80 per cent of them home."

Roberts dropped this small bombshell at a faculty meeting, with some colleagues supporting and some colleagues "differing" during a discussion afterwards, according to Associated Press dispatches.

They were careful to indicate, however, that their comments, questions and criticisms were to cover American colleges in general and not Colorado alone.

The good doctor posed some interesting questions. For instance, he asked "if the university was doing a proper job of teaching or was it running a social club?" Also: "Is the physical education program designed to produce healthy bodies or to provide a professional spectacle?" And still: "Is the school teaching hard ideals or the sophisticated art of getting along in a world of petty deceit?"

Roberts enumerated a few of his pet "easy subjects" which he would have deleted from the CU curriculum. The likes of education, psychology and life adjustment courses drew heavy fire.

The AP dryly reports that university officials had no comment, for the moment at least. However, we have faith that our mile-high colleague, the Colorado Daily, will have a few words to offer.



"IF I TAKE COURSES I DON'T NEED, I FIGGER I'LL GRADUATE IN TIME TO WORK LONG ENOUGH TO GO ON SOCIAL SECURITY."

James Marlow

Eisenhower Budget Leaves Average Man Up a Tree

WASHINGTON (AP)—Up a tree. That's where the average man is right now on President Eisenhower's budget.

How can he tell whether this budget—a record for peacetime—is good or bad, wise or foolish, enough or too little? He doesn't know enough to decide.

And that goes for this writer. It's the only honest thing to say.

In a little more than three months—since the Russian Sputniks shocked the world into sudden consciousness about space and missiles—the average man has been forced to feel left behind and out of date.

He can't even guess, because he can't even visualize the problems, whether 500 million dollars for research is enough or whether five times that much is needed to keep this country abreast of Russia.

Worse than that: The average man, to whom this new world of space flight is a blank, probably won't know for years whether this budget was shrewd or a penny-pinching folly. The results coming from this year's budget may not show up for years.

One thing is for sure: Eisenhower is bent on balancing the budget—that is, not spending more than the government expects to take in its revenues of all kinds. That was his goal when he took office. It still is.

To increase spending for defense, and still balance the budget, Eisenhower had to cut corners: by cutting down on domestic programs, such as public assistance, hospital construction, school construction.

That by itself raises a point: Last year Eisenhower asked Congress for money to help states build schools. He was very positive a lot more schools were needed. No doubt more schools are needed this year too.

But now he's dropping altogether the idea of money for schools, and instead is asking money to educate a limited number of young people, particularly in science.

The question therefore is: in this kind of society, rich and growing, is it for the good of the country to cut down on programs which only recently were

deemed essential in order to save on spending?

Or would it be better to go a little deeper into the red and leave the budget unbalanced by spending more than the government expects to take in?

In short, as the years go on and the contest with Russia grows perhaps more intense, are more and more things in the general field of public welfare to be sacrificed in order to get more money for defense while balancing the budget?

Eisenhower already has been both blamed and praised for the kind of budget he submitted.

Already—in fact, before he publicly disclosed his budget—some of the top generals complained he was not asking enough money for defense purposes.

This budget does not ask the people as a whole to make sacrifices. For example, while a tax cut appears out of the question this year, Eisenhower is not talking of raising taxes either.

One way to spend even more money—if more spending is really needed—and still balance the budget would be to raise taxes to increase federal revenue.

The budget Eisenhower offered is pretty much a business-as-usual budget. Only the future can pass judgment on his wisdom.

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.

ALLEN JOHNSON, Editor
GARY CAPPS, Business Manager
WILLIAM COOK, Editorial Page Editor
PHIL HAGER, Managing Editor
GLEN GRAVES, Advertising Mgr.
JACK WILSON, JERRY RAMSEY, Associate Editors
PEPPER ALLEN, News Editor
BOB MULLIN, Sports Editor
JOANNE MILLIGAN, Ass't Business Manager
Editorial Board: Allen Johnson, William Cook, Phil Hager, Pepper Allen, Jerry Ramsey, Jack Wilson, Bob Mullin.
Day Editors: Wally Slocum, John Lengel, Don Jepsen, Al Reynolds, Evie Olsen.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Emerald Editor:

As a student strongly interested in skiing may I compliment you for the excellent coverage you gave the sport in Tuesday's Emerald. As a student who spent considerable energy on one phase of the sport during Fall term I felt that one story was missing.

What is the story of the University of Oregon Ski Team? If I may draw upon my freshman physics and its laws of motion, I remember one that might help understand the movements of the ski team. Bodies inert tend to remain inert and it takes more force to make an inert body move than to keep a moving body in motion. A group of students got together this fall to provide the force to move the

inert U of O Ski Team. We hoped that others would see our effort and join with aid.

And we were aided. A local alum volunteered to be our coach, and we were admitted to the Athletic Dept. two nights a week to supplement our afternoon workouts. The Ski Club encouraged us and both the Emerald and Register-Guard gave us publicity. This help and our self-imposed training discipline brought us to the point at the end of the term of asking the help of the Athletic Department. We hoped to represent Oregon in several western intercollegiate ski events.

In the form of a carefully itemized budget, we requested about \$500 (OSC Ski Team gets \$1000 per year). We were told

that the Athletic Department could not afford our expense. Major sports such as Football and Basketball now support several other major and minor sports, and I feel that we of the ski team were well in motion toward qualifying for similar support. If the records of previous years tell anything of current Athletic Department finances I am safe in assuming that they could support a couple of dozen ski teams and several other minor groups. Oregon will be represented only at the Winter Carnival by our group supported with money provided by the ASUO. We hope for better luck next year.

Farley Maxwell
Junior in Education
Member of Ski Team