

Under New Management

A new staff takes over The Emerald today. With a change in staff, some natural changes in policy are to be expected. Frankly, we'll do our best to stick to a number of principles and ideas that have been set forth by this year's previous editors, Charles Mitchelmore and Allen Johnson. We're proud of the work that's been done by these two men and hope we can keep it up.

We do plan some changes, however, and it's only fair to "warn" our readers of our policy.

The Emerald will attempt to get a wide range of opinion on its editorial page. We believe a college newspaper should be concerned more with stimulating opinion than with influencing it. But don't for one minute think we'll take neutral stands on controversial issues. The Emerald hasn't backed down from fights in the past, and we've no intention of doing so now.

To attain this wider range of opinion we plan to run more individual columns than in the past. When there is room, two columnists' ideas will be published. In the past, letters to the editor have lived issues greatly. We will continue to welcome letters to the editor, provided they are signed and within a 400 word maximum limit. Once a week a "guest" column will be written by a faculty member, who may write on any subject he chooses. Other "guest" columns are planned, too.

The editorial board will be extended

from seven to ten members. The ten board members we're sure will offer ten different opinions to draw ideas from in order to mold vigorous, intelligent editorial stands. An editorial cartoonist will be on hand to add color and campus interest to editorial page art.

In presenting its views, The Emerald is often forced to "step on toes." We're not out to hurt feelings, damage reputations or sabotage any particular organizations or groups of individuals—but if "stepping on toes" is in the best interests of the students we won't hesitate to do so. We are particularly fortunate that the University allows a "free press" with no direct control of editorial policy. While welcoming criticism of editorial policy, we will always defend the principle of the free press.

One change you'll notice is the "World News In Brief" column. Certainly, our aim can not be "completeness" in this column. Rather we hope that it will serve as a guide to further investigation of important world happenings. Emphasis will still be on campus news coverage, but we believe the world news column will serve a definite purpose for the reader.

These aren't the only changes that will be made, as you'll see from day to day. But they're the most pertinent, we felt, to the purpose of The Oregon Daily Emerald: to present information, to present ideas, and to serve its readers as best it can. (P.H.)

+ + + - -

A Victory, But—

No matter how small the act, there is a commanding advantage in having taken the offensive in any political struggle.

The Soviet veto of President Eisenhower's open skies plan for the Arctic Friday was somewhat of a "propaganda victory" for the West. It, moreover, was an example of what can be gained when a nation is willing to take the initiative and force an issue.

More explicitly, in saying to the Russians, "Will you agree to a mutual arms-inspection plan for the arctic area?" the United States was forcing the Soviet Union to tell the world that she either was not willing to move forward in the direction of demilitarization, or that she would follow the lead of the U.S. in working for some ease in the international tension.

In either instance, the United States is in the command position.

There is, and has been in this country, the danger in putting too much stock in words without actions. This is not to minimize the value of a propaganda advantage. In an ideological struggle, which the Cold War is, what the uncommitted people hear from the central figures will do much to determine those countries' future actions.

Yet, as George Kennan pointed out in his controversial Reith Lectures, since the

Russians are waging an ideological battle on the "imperialist" nations, they are not deterred by our shouts and threats, but only by the positive actions which we take against them. Kennan says that the Soviets have no real deadline when they will have had to conquer the world. Rather, they plod along, trying to persuade, disillusion, and blackmail countries to their side, content to let us defeat ourselves.

This we can surely do. And this we shall do if we consider idle talk and threats to be a substitute for foreign policy.

Country Club Tag

The Emerald starts today a three-part series of articles on Oregon's so-called "country club" reputation. Also, editorial cartoonist Les Gong for the next few days will present his impressions of this reputation.

Virtually everyone on the campus agrees that we aren't really a country club—at least in the full sense of the words. We don't disagree. We would like to examine, however, how this reputation is developed, how it hurts the University and its students, and what people want to do about it.

The "country club" reputation may be totally unfounded—but it's still there, and it should be discussed.

The Oregon "Country Clubber"



Dave Cass

Writer Says Election System Leans Toward Small Group

Having been around for a good number of years, I feel that it's only fitting that I make some cryptic comments regarding last week's ASUO election.



This was an amusing election — not so amusing as some and definitely more so than others. As a campus election it would range in the middle of a scale with its extremes in the abortive floundering of the OSP and the sparing manifestations of serious caricature.

Don't interpret this as disgruntled or bitter. Nor is what follows necessarily a reflection on those elected, any more than it's a reflection on those electing. Let what is said fall where it must.

One of the most amusing things was the candidates who seemed to feel the call of the electorate. It seemed that everybody and his brother decided to run. Each house jumped into the middle for prestige.

This would have been fine except that many of those organizations offering have only loud mouths or intellectual dissipates at their disposal. The weaknesses of student government are not minimized by the election of some smiling idiot whose qualifications run along the lines of serving on one SU committee, chairman of the Let's Keep Alive the Rosebowl Spirit committee, Greek Week Chariot Race time keeper, forceful, dynamic, aggressive, a scholar (three point in Ed.).

The campaigning was in keeping with the quality of the candidates and interested voters. As a matter of fact, some of these people would do quite well in Southern primary battles. (It might pay for some graduate in political science to forget his amateur politics for awhile and attempt to correlate this trend toward more irrelevant campaigns and increasing Democrat registration). The relationship of posters all over hell and a candidate's abilities escapes me, except that it seems to be in an obscure is this same relationship

with car parades or their torch variety. I always wonder what such enthusiasm is all about.

The actual voting, in mechanics and results, was enough to unnerve Elmo Roper. All manner of corruptive possibilities presented themselves in the way in which actual balloting was handled. The voter handed his ballot to some election official who would then monkey around with it before placing it in the ballot box. What this illustrates is not so much the farcical nature of the voting as the absolute superfluity of the vice-president, who is supposedly in charge of elections.

That two partially contradictory amendments were both passed needs no comment. I only ask you to speculate on the passage of the other amendment, reducing the number of qualified voters needed to pass an amendment from 1/3 to 1/4. Math majors: calculate this progression and the number of years before it takes no voters to pass an amendment!

The most important point is that none of these amendments rectifies the central weakness of the present electoral set-up, preferential voting. On top of this they only partially ameliorate the method by which unsuccessful presidential aspirants become incompetent vice-presidents and sure-thing senators.

Perhaps at one time both these were necessary to perpetuate a clique of fraternity boys in which there may have been a dearth of quality. Perhaps the same is true today. But it cannot be disputed that at the heart of the weak student government and even weaker support lies an election system that caters to a small group, which of necessity has no monopoly on either talent or imagination. This was abundantly expressed last week.

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.

PHIL HAGER, Editor
BILL BRYANT, Business Manager

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Emerald Editor:

At the last meeting of the Committee for Student Awareness, over 250 signatures had been obtained in support of the ending of nuclear bomb tests. In view of the limitations on our time and objectives Thursday, May 8, will terminate our efforts to secure signatures. We have received letters from Senator Morse and Representative Porter thanking us for our activity and interest in this issue.

I have been asked to present the arguments in favor of ending nuclear bomb tests. In the following paragraphs I have listed for the benefit of those

who could not attend the panel discussion on this issue those questions whose answers, I feel, favor ending the tests.

1) Why should we go to a lot of trouble to develop a clean bomb when we have no assurance that a war will be fought with clean bombs? Isn't our purpose to keep the weapons large and horrible enough so that no one will want to play the war game?

2) Are the returns from testing so great that it would be foolish not to continue? Are we really changing the essence of the atomic bomb from these tests and making improvements

we could not do without?

3) What would happen if we stopped testing? Would Russia be forced to stop because of the risk of a propaganda defeat? Would our ability to build atomic and hydrogen bombs be impaired? Could we not detect Soviet tests?

4) What are the hazards of not stopping tests? Is not radioactive fallout a danger to health and an assault on personal rights? Will not a continuation of the precedence of tests allow many nations of questionable political stability access to those weapons whose wide possession

(Continued on page 3)