

Subtle Pressure

# Student Court Unnecessary

Back to committee this week goes the proposal for a "student judiciary board." The ASUO senate last Thursday twice passed in favor of the board "in principle." This does not mean, however, that the senate necessarily will formulate a student court.

What then does it mean? Evidently it means that most of the senators rather like the idea of "peers judging peers," which is the slogan that backers of the student judiciary board idea have tagged onto the plan.

The Emerald last week advised against adopting the proposed board. After studying the proposal further, we are even more convinced of our previous stand: the proposed board—if it should ever be put into effect—is not needed and would not be, by any stretch of the imagination, more effective or efficient than the present discipline set-up.

Persons who favor the plan, we feel, have not examined it closely. This is especially evident among members of the senate. When the proposal was brought up in the last meeting, a quick vote "on principle" was passed with only two nay votes after no discussion. Few senators questioned the general idea of the plan until they began to work their way through the proposed court's constitution article by article. Finally, during a recess, it became apparent to remaining senators that the entire idea should be studied more carefully before wading blindly into technicalities. Eventually, after moving back through "Robert's Rules of Order" red tape, the senate voted to reconsider the whole idea "in principle."

On the second "principle" vote, the ayes won again, but only by a 12-7 margin (a

number of senators had left the meeting by this time.) Then, too, on this second vote, at least a few of the senators spoke against the proposal.

The chief objection to the plan has been raised by senators Duncan Ferguson and George Brittingham. Their point was this: Could backers of the plan offer one good reason to formulate such a board? The backers replied that the proposed board was "an extension of student government" that would institute a more healthy "peers judging peers" atmosphere in student discipline cases.

But these rather weak arguments are weakened even further by the fact that three students already sit on the present student-faculty discipline committee. Any student who appears before a dean has the right to take his case before this committee. Hence, "peers" already judge "peers" when a student wants "peer judgment." (Indications are that few students would really want "peer judgment"—in the present student-faculty committee, faculty members often have had to lessen a punishment suggested by the student members.)

The present discipline set-up is more effective and efficient than any purely student board could hope to be. We hope the committee that is considering the proposal will examine it carefully. We think they'll find the proposed student judiciary board is unnecessary.

\* \* \*

## Footnotes

Latest sign to adorn a small foreign car: Please Don't Crush Me, I Eat Harmful Insects.



"I USTA HAVE SO MUCH TROUBLE GETTING THEM IN AT CLOSING HOURS— WILL YOU TURN ON THE WATER, MAE?"

## Dave Cass

# Latest Anonymous Brochure Lacks Reason, Responsibility

One morning last week I found, instead of the usual, cheery campus daily, an unusual publication serving as reading matter with my breakfast. This was a mimeographed tract, which informed me, "HO HUM IT'S ELECTION TIME OR APATHY ARISE."



Reading further, I discovered that this was the inspired title for a fair example of written gabble. Ostensibly its purpose was to arouse an apathetic student body to the creeping control of the student government by a malicious administration.

My immediate reaction was to connect this sheet with the Committee for Action, a group with similar purposes and methods that circulated comparable foolish disgruntlement last term. My suspicion seemed to be confirmed by a comparison of print and by the parallel use of broken English.

In this regard, before the group(?) becomes permanently deactivated by reason of expulsion (on academic and not political grounds) I would suggest two improvements: first, that they(?) borrow or steal a typewriter that strikes capitals, and second, that they(?) sit in on a few comp classes, or, better yet, secure a copy of Rudolph Flesch's "The Art of Plain Talk." (The question mark is inserted because I doubt that any collective mind would be so ignorant as to use such barbarisms as "to" for "too," "vigorous" for "vigorous," "is" for "are," . . .)

Of course, I did wonder at this pathetic use of English by a group attempting to influence college students. Speculation has led me to believe that this was perhaps a foreign group—some latter-day followers of Bakunin who, instead of the philosophical pleas "property is theft," are organized under the banner "the administration is a thief." I await the dynamiting of Johnson Hall or the assassination of certain notables—not without a certain amount of glee!

The one message I did get

from this garbled communication was that it was anti-administration and that it was attempting to draw some tenuous relationship between the failings of student government and this ogre, the administration.

For this reason it hardly requires serious consideration. A belief in simple and mistaken cause-effect relationships arises from simple and mistaken thinking. I'm reminded of certain Seattle news commentator whose sole basis of analysis was the belief that the "Papal Conspiracy," not international communism, was the biggest threat to the free world. People listened to him because he was ludicrous.

Now, I'm not an apologist for the administration or student government. But a mixture of fact, falsehood, hearsay, and the like sheds no light on the one thing about which this group is correct, namely, that there is something wrong with our student government.

In many ways student government is in a deplorable state. Signs of this would be a high school teacher coming to the defense of an errant (and mistaken) senator (and fraternity brother), a student body that doesn't give a tinker's dam, a raging case of Victorian reaction, and so on. It would be silly to claim that this has no relation to the administration and its policies, but to explain our troubles wholly or even mostly by such reference is even sillier.

A more fruitful field of inquiry would be the many causes of the predominance of the Greek system, and the consequence of this, the general 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  
JERRY RAMSEY, Managing Editor  
BILL BRYANT, Advertising Mgr.  
JACK WILSON, PHIL HAGER, Associate Editors  
PEPPER ALLEN, News Editor  
BOB MULLIN, Sports Editor

## Our Contemporaries

# Propaganda Tests

(Editor's Note: The following article is reprinted from the April 12 issue of The Economist of London.)

Last week President Eisenhower admitted that, although in his view the Russian abandonment of nuclear tests was just a "gimmick," not to be taken seriously, yet he might have been mistaken when he refused to try and counter-attack its undoubted propaganda value by explaining in advance why the United States itself might suspend nuclear testing unilaterally and unconditionally after the series which is to begin later this month. Whether or not American testing will actually be abandoned depends officially on whether or not the coming series gives the scientists all the information they want.

But it looks as if, when the matter next comes before the National Security Council, the President will move over to the side of those who put political and psychological considerations ahead of military ones in the matter; according to reports this group is headed by Mr. Dulles, while the Secretary of Defense and the head of the Atomic Energy Commission lead those who insist that military needs must come first.

This disagreement, it is said, explains the lack of initiative and imagination in the Administration's approach to the suspension of nuclear tests, a question which has been under discussion for two years. But even now the President is trying to avoid taking the final decision: he has ordered his advisers to present him with an agreed view on this and other aspects of dis-

armament policy by the end of the month.

There is a good military case for the coming series of tests—and a good psychological one, too, if only it had been presented before the Russians seized the limelight. Warheads for the long-range missiles on which American defense depends increasingly are to be tested and so are small atomic weapons for tactical use. The emphasis will be on "clean" explosions, which do not spread radioactivity.

Only those who oppose all nuclear tests on principle, such as the international group of distinguished scientists and citizens who have filed suit in a Washington court against the Secretary of Defense and the AEC, argue that the coming series should be abandoned. To do that, even critics of the Administration realize, would be to give the Russians, who have just finished their own annual series of tests, a real as well as a propaganda victory.

Many of these critics are, however, urging that, as a counter-propaganda move, the United States should publicize the "dirtiness" of the Russian tests which are alleged to have brought a record amount of radioactive fallout around the world.

But the AEC opposes such a campaign, partly because it claims that the facts could not be given without exposing its secret system of collecting information and partly because that information will not have fully assessed for months—and when it is the notorious American tests of 1954 may turn out to have been more noxious.

# Letters to the Editor

## Emerald Editor:

The Emerald's recent series of letters discussing the controversial nuclear weapons testing has been of great interest to many persons. I would like to offer my opinion on a subject which I feel has a bearing on this controversy but which has a much more general application. This subject is the position of the scientist as an instrument in the development of public opinion.

Dr. Pauling and the signers of his now-famous petition are outstanding examples of the position in which the American scientist finds himself. A scientist is paid to objectively accumulate, analyze, and interpret data concerning a given problem. Seldom on the basis of these objective results is there any emotional dispute as to the validity of the findings. The data are published in journals and newspapers, and thus the result of scientific investigations is made available to the general public. If someone should discover a variable which had been neglected, or improve a technique, or prove a theory which challenges the interpretation of the data, we accept these changes, and in the scientific world these changes are called progress. At any given time, scientists as well as societies can only function within the limits of their knowledge.

The effect of radiation on living organisms has been of subject of intense study in recent years, and to date radiation biologists have concluded essentially two facts. (1) Any amount of radiation has certain detrimental effects on the living

(Continued on page 3)