

Finances and the Rally Squad

Last week we discussed the problems facing Oregon's rally squad and the concept of "school spirit" in its altered modern meaning. Since then, we have heard several favorable comments on Dan Arensmeier's group, including a letter to the editor from Athletic Director Leo Harris. Now perhaps some more specific comments are in order.

First, a look at their financial situation: the rally board needs more money. But an increase in the \$350 from the ASUO and \$600 from the Athletic Department doesn't seem likely unless student fees are also raised. These two sums constitute a unified budget which isn't often adequate—especially when "emergencies" like the Rose Bowl come up.

At Pasadena, Oregon's cheerleaders had to make some concessions to the lack of funds. They missed possible pre-game Los Angeles appearances in order to fly there with the Oregon band. They saved money but dropped into obscurity, except for the game, by staying with the band at Occidental College. Quarters at the Ambassador Hotel would have better satisfied everyone, but the money wasn't there.

With the present budget, don't look for improvement in the matter of trips next year. The Duck gridders have dates at Miami, Florida, and at Norman, Oklahoma, but unless special dispensations are made between now and then, the yell king alone will be fortunate to make one of the trips. Nor is the cheerleading outlook any brighter for basketball. Belko's Ducks played this weekend in Seattle, a region heavily popu-

lated with Oregon alumni, without a member of the rally squad on hand to see them upset the Huskies.

This kind of student representation, from a school on the upgrade of national sports-prestige, can't be called desirable.

We've heard some tentative solutions to the problem, but they all have their weaknesses. For instance, an athletic-type "ride" for the yell king has been suggested. But if this were the case, the athletic department would justly have the right to select its yell king, and then the question would arise: "Who should the rally squad represent, and to whom should it be answerable—ASUO or athletic department?"

We would like to think that an upsurge in athletic department income, prompted by the current success of Oregon sports, might provide an answer to some of the rally squad's problems. Conversely, it seems that the presence of an effective, "paid for" squad is as important to a financially-successful football game as brand-new jerseys or practice balls.

Thus, the best chance for a future increase of the rally board budget seems to lie in the direction of the athletic department. Two considerations will be involved: 1) the cheerleaders must continue to demonstrate their new worth, and 2) the Athletic department will rightfully assume more control over the group it will support.

This may be the best answer if Oregon's rally squads are to keep pace with its growing athletic reputation.

+ + +

Two-way Street

A spirited battle has been predicted over President Eisenhower's request to Congress for a five-year extension of the reciprocal trade act. The act (officially known as the Trade Agreements Act) allows the executive branch of the government to make moderate cuts in U. S. tariffs if other countries agree to make cuts in tariffs on U.S. imports. The President is also asking Congress to grant him the authority to cut tariffs as much as 10 per cent a year, but not more than 25 per cent over the five-year period.

The tariff question is always a controversial one and especially so in these times of economic "recession." Eisenhower can expect some Democratic opposition to the bill—but he will find it more difficult to get support from his own party. He had a hard time finding a Republican Senator willing to introduce the bill.

High tariff exponents claim that some foreign imports injure domestic industries. They will likely point to the recession to

bolster their arguments.

But it will be unfortunate if the reciprocal trade act is not extended or if it is weakened with amendments. First of all, 4,500,000 Americans directly depend on our export trade for their jobs. When tariffs are raised, they are raised on both sides of the fence and the end result is less trade, less production and fewer jobs.

There is another, and perhaps more important, reason for keeping on good terms with other countries in trade agreements:

The Soviet Union is now busily engaged in an all-out economic war against the U. S. We'd help the Soviet cause with a high tariff policy that reduced our trade with other nations. As Columnist Marquis Childs put it: "Rubber workers who lose their jobs in Malaya and miners thrown out of work in Mexico will blame the U. S. for their troubles and the Communists will be only too willing to encourage this view."

It is apparent the U. S. should not withdraw behind a high-tariff wall. If the reciprocal trade act is crippled, the U. S. will find itself badly hurt both at home and abroad.

Lust for Knowledge



"IMAGINE! A PHI BETA KAPPA FINDING ME INTERESTING! WHY, I BARELY HAVE A 'C' AVERAGE!"

Dave Cass

Modern Educators Lacking In Knowledge of Culture

Back in the ninth grade our social living class spent a whole quarter studying vocations. The idea of the vocational unit was that at 15 a person should have pretty clearly in mind what he intended to do with his life.

In pursuit of this goal, we made up interviews with prominent representatives of various occupations, composed lists of the good and bad points associated with different types of work (lifted from promotional pamphlets such as "A Career in the Air Force" or the unbiased "Business and You" put out by the NAM), and imaginatively followed our idol through a day's work.

The idea was to keep busy; then we wouldn't have nasty spelling tests or boring grammar exercises. As I remember, everybody planned to be a professional, or at least a white collar. This, though most of us hadn't mastered the multiplication tables and the boys still held spitting contests in the lavatories during the noon hour.

Other than these minor deficiencies, our background for choosing a life's work was thorough; the previous year we had learned to read road maps and why we celebrate Thanksgiving (for the eighth time).

These were the good old days, when the Encyclopedia Britannica produced reports on any conceivable subject with only the effort of copying involved, and when education began and ended at 8 a.m.

But, unless one has definitely passed out of youth (in his own mind), reminiscing must have a point. And my point is pretty apparent—our education is in a pretty distressing state.

It's not just that science isn't being taught, or that Johnny isn't bilingual, or that facilities are woefully inadequate, it's much deeper. The prevailing concept of education in the United States is deranged, and not so that it can be easily treated.

This isn't to say that our concept of education was ever very

close to the ideal, or even very explicit. Only a fool could believe this. Rather, public education, which was never very ideal, has taken a turn for the worse. Along with, and causing as much as being caused, this regression has spawned what could be called the "educational mind."

The educational mind developed to attempt a reconciliation within a society that dotes on education, but abhors the educated — the egghead or the genius who can't tie his shoelaces.

The educated person is disturbing and controversial—he asks why, and therefore is not to be tolerated by those who are unable to ask why. To admit that such a reconciliation must come about is stupid; to attempt it is asinine.

But this is exactly what is happening in our schools of education (perhaps the past tense would be more appropriate), when educators try to rationalize as a philosophy of education.

The idea is essentially that to train a mind is synonymous with using a mind in daily existence. The educational mind's philosophy is summed up in the title of the core course of any "modern" school: social living. In short, it is the mind that hopes to build a high school one-third home economics, one-

(Continued on page 3)

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Emerald Editor:

I was pleased to see in a column in Monday's Emerald that some of those on campus who do not agree with the ideas I advance about the legality of state institutions supporting discriminatory groups had noticed my recent appearance at the Erb. I was even more pleased to note that the columnist felt called upon to justify the existence of discriminatory groups as a response to my criticisms. This means the ideas I espoused succeeded in rocking the boat even if only on an intellectual level. I only wish that the boat I had in mind rocking, that is, the administration, had been as responsive.

However, some of the points I mentioned in my appearance will bear reiteration since they do not seem to be fully understood.

1. The Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution prohibits support of discrimination by a state. This includes state action taken by an instrumentality or agency of the state such as a state university. The argument that the university's support of private groups on campus was not state support has, it seems to me, been exploded permanently by a very recent decision of the United States Supreme Court. The case involved a private trust fund set up to support an

orphanage for white males. The trust fund and orphanage were administered by a committee which was part and parcel of the public governmental structure. Two negro orphans were denied admittance because of the discriminatory provision of the trust. The courts of the state involved, Pennsylvania, labored long in legalese to show that state support was not involved. The highest court of our country disregarded the sophisticated arguments of the lower court and clearly held that the state had supported discrimination, contrary to the Constitution, when the administering group had permitted the dis-

(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.

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
Editorial Board: Allen Johnson, William Cook, Phil Hager, Pepper Allen, Jerry Ramsey, Jack Wilson, Bob Mullin.
Day Editors: Wally Slocum, Linda Van Matre, Judi Sears, Al Reynolds, Evie Olsen.
Night Editors: Jerry Ramsey, Don Jensen, Pat Treece, Barbara Stepper, JoAnn Shore.