

The Senate's Ski-motion

Last week's Senate meeting, the first of spring term, featured an issue carried over from winter: the possibility of a UO ski-team.

To begin things, Athletic Director Leo Harris and Track Coach Bill Bowerman, a ski enthusiast himself, presented the Athletic Department's views on a possible Oregon ski team. In brief, this view was: "It would be nice, but at present it isn't possible." Said Harris, in response to a question from the Senate: "We shouldn't sacrifice sports we have now, to expand the scope of our program . . . We would rather expand in the sports activities we now are operating."

The following main points were enumerated by Harris and Bowerman against an official, Athletic Department-sponsored ski team: 1) There are no funds which could be used to support such a venture, 2) Past conduct of UO-connected skiing groups has been below acceptable standards, 3) Skiing is not a warranted competitive sport for the University of Oregon, because of practice difficulties, irregular sources of competition, etc.

Harris pointed out to the Senate that for the past several years, football has been the only "profit-making" Oregon sport, and that even income from the gridiron would not keep the University from losing money on its athletic program next year. He also noted that requests are often made for other teams, including sailing, crew, bowling etc.

Opposed to this viewpoint at Thursday's session were spokesmen for a UO-ski-squad, including several Senate members and some members of the audience. Their main point was that widespread student interest in a team warranted Athletic Department support.

The matter soon came to a head in an unprecedented action by ASUO prexy Bud Titus, who relinquished his chair to vice-president Dunc Ferguson, and moved that the Senate recommend that interested students work with the Athletic Department to form an official UO ski team. The motion passed by a wide margin.

What about it? Apart from any consideration of the advisability of Titus' move, the Senate's motion was a commendable one; a recommendation worthy of Oregon student government.

Here's why: there's no doubt at all that the Athletic Department is financially "strapped" for funds—athletics, like other big business, can have its recessions, and at least Oregon's is in terms of growth. Like Harris, we'd hate to see the quality of, say, UO football and track damaged just to force into being some new minor sports, as would

be the case if these new sports drained funds from their bigger counterparts.

But . . . there seem to be a significant number of University students interested in supporting a ski-team. There is a very good possibility that these people are capable of more responsible behavior than some of their predecessors.

There is almost a certainty that such a group, if it indeed exists, warrants more consideration from the Athletic Department than Harris indicated it would get. In other words, if soccer, or lacrosse, were to become for some reason a very popular well-organized competitive sport at Oregon, then it seems to us that the Athletic Department would be duty-bound (duty to whom? To UO students) to add it to its program. Skiing hasn't reached this point yet, but there are good indications that it could.

So we have a not-very-neat dilemma, a justified student "want" versus an inelastic financial situation. But there seems to be a way out, as suggested by Bill Bowerman Thursday, and it is in terms of this solution that The Emerald approves of the Senate's recommendation.

Bowerman suggested that if UO skiers were interested enough, they should frankly "panhandle" for their cause—in gentler terms, they should approach prospective donors to Oregon athletics, who support a large share of UO athletics already. One Senate member had already noted that there was some alumni interest in a Webfoot ski-squad.

At this point, we encounter the second stage of our dilemma. When approached for funds, prospective donors to the ski team will ask "Will you have Athletic Department endorsement and supervision?" And of course, at present, the answer would have to be a shamefaced "No . . ."

So here's where the Senate's action comes in: if the ski-people are on their toes, they'll follow up the ASUO endorsement they've been given with some vocal and well-formulated discussions with the Athletic Department, leading to some sort of "official," if conditional, approval of their plans. This, from above, is absolutely necessary if they are to enlist, beg, beseech or inveigle funds to support their sport.

If the ski-enthusiasts make their plans in a businesslike manner, they will surely get the needed Athletic Department help. If they are businesslike, but don't get the help, then Thursday's Senate recommendation opens the way to a close look at a policy that would refuse them justified endorsement.

First, they should use the Senate's support to help justify such an endorsement.

Academic Tourists



US Maintains Military Edge; Russia May Grow Meanwhile

By JAMES MARLOW

WASHINGTON (AP)—What do you, the man in the street, have to look forward to on a question which may mean your life: This country's ability to handle itself in case of a Soviet attack or desire to attack?

A good part of that answer has come in pieces and bits over these past few weeks from American military leaders and key men in the Eisenhower administration, either in testimony before Congress or in speeches.

The latest views of present and future has come from a man whose own knowledge of American and Soviet strength is a basic element in shaping the thinking of the government: Allen W. Dulles.

Dulles, brother of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, is director of the Central Intelligence Agency, which is this country's super-spy agency overseas. He gave some of his thinking in New Orleans this week.

Since it coincides with testimony given Congress by the military leaders in large part, it can be summarized here as the attitude of the Eisenhower administration toward the Soviet Union, present and future.

The Soviets do not now have military superiority over the United States and are not likely to provoke war "at this time."

The reason is they know this country has the power, through long-range bombers and nuclear bombs, to retaliate with such terrible devastation that it would not be sensible to start a war which would cause the U.S.S.R. such damage.

In short, Dulles said "I consider that our military posture is stronger and our ability to inflict damage is today greater than that of the Soviet Union."

Dulles was thus reflecting what seems to a great self-confidence—about the present, that is—which seems to permeate the top military leaders of the country.

But this doesn't necessarily mean that even if the United States should stay ahead of the Soviets militarily—and that's questionable—that the Soviet Union will not be able to move step by step to gobble up the world. Why?

Because they are putting their greatest emphasis on long-range missiles which could reach not

only any part of Europe or Asia but the United States, too.

Just assume that in 10 years both the United States and the Soviet Union have all the long-range missiles they need. Does that mean the two sides just glare at each other, with both afraid to move?

Actually—and this is interpreting what has been said—such a stalemate in terror weapons may work to Soviet advantage. Without starting war, the Soviets may try conquest by subversion, infiltration, economic help and other means.

If they so move—without provoking war—would the United States start a war over nonmilitary Soviet aggression?

It hardly seems likely, if only because once the United States tried shooting missiles the Soviets with the same kind of long-range weapons could make us sorry we started, just as we could make them sorry now.

So there may be years of so-called peace which is not peace. Dulles himself doesn't think Premier Nikita Khrushchev wants war.

He said: Khrushchev "is convinced that the final victory of communism can be achieved mainly by nonmilitary means. Here the Soviet economic offensive looms large."

To sum up: The leaders don't look for war now or anytime soon. Yet no one is predicting the Soviets won't inch their way around the world by other means.

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.

JERRY RAMSEY, Editor
BILL RYANT, Business Manager
PEPPER ALLEN, Managing Editor
DON JEPSEN, News Editor
WARREN RUCKER, SUE CLARK, Co-Advertising Managers
MIKE HOLLISTER, DAVE LORTIE, Associate Editors
DICK MCKINNEY, RANNY GREEN, Sports Editors
KAREN MAUNEY, Women's Editor
TOM CHAPMAN, FACETS, Managing Editor
MIKE FORRESTER, News Editor
LOUIS PARKER, Photo Editor
Editorial Board: Jerry Ramsey, Don Jepsen, Pepper Allen, Dave Lortie, Mike Hollister, Ranny Green, Larry Kurtz, Jeff Williams, May Jo Stewart, Karen Mauney.
Assistant News Editors: Jeff Williams, Larry Kurtz

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Emerald Editor:

For your printing of and your editorial attitude towards the comments of one Miss Lauri Silven, my estimate of your sheet has increased many-fold.

Now that you have done the groundwork, I wonder if this issue will go anywhere, or if it will die on the vine as has every other controversial issue around this campus. Students here have a very consistent habit of burying their heads in the sand when a bad situation stares them in the face. Never have I heard more comments expressing discontent over a system and never have I seen so little being done about it. Soon, the educations of these students will take on some meaning and they will begin to act and react as intelligent citizens; citizens who will not allow themselves to be bullied.

Wouldn't it be interesting if one night very soon, 10:30 came

and went and still the women's dorms were empty. What could these God-like people in charge do when such a massive discontent has been shown. I feel the University would care more about keeping its students and getting more of them than it would care to maintain such a bigoted system.

It is time that an end was put to such stupidity.

Laurence S. Cole

Senior in Psychology

Emerald Editor:

A college student should be responsible for his actions, and he should devote some time to thinking before acting. However, it is true that a number of us lack this kind of responsibility.

There is something on the campus that has been bothering me for a long time. I am speaking about the different kinds of

illustrations, engravings, and literature that appear on the walls of many of the campus lavatories. I am not trying to be funny. These are products of a "sick" imagination (I can't think of a better word than sick), and I don't believe they are necessary decorations for these types of locations where sanity should prevail.

In a "survey" that I have made recently, I have found out that the literature that appears in the above mentioned places is not written only in English, but in Russian and Arabic, as well! I wonder if some language students are trying to prove their skills in this way.

Let's hope that in the future we will not see any additional pieces of primitive art and vulgar literature. Let's be more serious and not be involved in actions that remind us of low-

(Continued on page 3)