

Little Man on Campus

The University Recognizes

"The University of Oregon recognizes its continuing obligation and opportunity...."

The key word in this portion of the statement of purpose for Charter Day, 1959, is continuing.

Charter Day is not solely an observance of things past. It is a recognition of the University's role now and in the future. On this occasion we honor men who have distinguished themselves in service to their state. These men are recognized because they have contributed to intellectual and social progress.

On this day we also observe tradition; not the tradition associated with ivy covered buildings or alma mater songs, but the tradition of the University's continuing advancement.

We have an opportunity on this Charter Day to re-evaluate and reaffirm our goals as students at the University. This is one event during the year that is set aside from the usual round of social activities. On this anniversary of the University's founding, emphasis is on the intellectual and cultural opportunities available to us.

We came to college "to get an education." This word, "education," is a big word. It implies not only knowledge, but the wisdom

to use that knowledge. Education is the opportunity to learn; to discard some ideas and to choose others. An educated man is necessarily an intellectually free man, for he has had the opportunity to choose his philosophy, his ideology, from the accumulated wealth of centuries of thought.

There is much more to the observance of Charter Day than the procession of the faculty, a speech or two, the chance to get out of class. We are commemorating the purposes for which the University was founded—to achieve progress, to disseminate knowledge and to preserve freedom of thought.

To realize the significance of Charter Day is to realize your place in the University. The men who will speak to you, who will be awarded citations for outstanding intellectual contributions to society, are men who early learned the true value of education. Granted each of them has been blessed with a fine mind which has placed them in niches considerably above what the average college student can expect.

But without the determination and drive, and an early discovery of the values of education, they would not be where they are today. Intellectual capacity is a God-given gift; using it is up to the student.



Ike Dominates Foreign Policy But Herter Starting to Emerge

By JAMES MARLOW
Associated Press News Analyst
WASHINGTON (AP)—Christian A. Herter, ever since he became secretary of state last spring, has stayed so much in the background that President Eisenhower has clearly dominated American foreign relations.

This was particularly true while Premier Nikita Khrushchev was here. There seem to be two possible explanations: Either Herter wants it that way or it's the result of his own mild, self-effacing nature.

Whatever the reason, it's a startling contrast with the way John Foster Dulles ran the State Department. Dulles would have done most of the talking before and after President Eisenhower's conference with Khrushchev.

Now Herter and his department seem to be asserting themselves although somewhat belatedly and in an oblique, almost strange, kind of way.

At a news conference a couple of weeks ago, the second he has held in Washington, Herter had some rather mild things to say.

He said the United States holds the Soviet Union responsible in some degree for the actions of other Communist bloc countries, including Red China. Words like "some degree" can be stretched like rubber bands.

So Herter really didn't upset anything Eisenhower had accomplished with Khrushchev. He may have been trying to needle the Soviet Premier a bit or maybe create a little friction between him and the Red Chinese.

But all in all Herter expressed optimism about the long range value of Khrushchev's visit. So the score was pretty much no hits, no runs, and no errors.

Then last week Andrew H. Berding, one of Herter's right-hand men, got into the act in a puzzling way. Berding is an assistant secretary of state for public affairs.

Berding, in a speech here, was critical of Khrushchev for talking about wanting peaceful coexistence with the United States. The Soviet leader had talked of beating this country but said he wanted it done through peaceful competition.

Berding said "peaceful co-

existence" has a "seductive flavor."

"Accepting peaceful coexistence means accepting the status quo whereby the Soviet Union dominates a Communist bloc of nations," Berding said.

"We cannot accept a status quo which" makes it impossible for the people in the block nations to have "true freedom, genuine national independence, and ability to establish whatever form of government they want."

It's hard to see what he's talking about. If Berding and the State Department—if he's talking for the department—do not want peaceful coexistence, what do they want?

Does he have some better proposal? He didn't offer it. He can talk all he wants about not accepting the status quo of the satellite nations, but that's exactly what this country has accepted for years.

There was a time when the United States might have intervened to upset the status quo—when the Hungarians revolted—but this country wanted no part of intervention since it almost surely would have meant war with the Soviet Union.

But since the United States doesn't want to go to war over the satellites and since the Soviets show no sign of relaxing their grip on them, then this country faces indefinitely Soviet domination of the satellites.

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.

- DON JEPSEN, Editor
 - WARREN RUCKER, Business Manager
 - JEFF WILLIAMS, Managing Editor
 - STEVE MILLIKIN, Advertising Manager
 - MARY JO STEWART, News Editor
 - KAREN MAUNEY, Associate Editor
 - ELLIOT CARLSON, Associate Editor
 - LARRY KURTZ, Sports Editor
 - EVERETT CUTLER, Entertainment Editor
 - JOHN RUSSELL, Photo Editor
 - ARLENE SAUNDERS, Women's Editor
 - KEITH POWELL, Finance Editor
- Editorial Board: Don Jepsen, Jeff Williams, Karen Mauney, Elliot Carlson, Ranny Green, Mary Jo Stewart, Larry Kurtz, Everett Cutler, Peggy Doerflinger, Ladsy Atland, Hugh Mitchell

A Fine Selection

If the caliber of the faculty appointed to the Honors Program curriculum committee is any indication of what the quality of Oregon's Honors College is going to be, then the students here are indeed fortunate.

We doubt whether such an exciting group of minds and personalities has ever been brought together in one important committee at Oregon before.

It is very likely that any student who is familiar with these instructors will say, "Gee, I wish I were a superior student."

The job before these nine men—of selecting and organizing the Honors curriculum is indeed a big one. And when one realizes

they must teach a full schedule of classes besides organizing the Honors program by fall of 1960, their task looks doubly hard.

But to H. T. Koplin, head of the Honors College, and the others who selected this first committee, we say, "You sure know how to pick them!"

Footnotes

If you appreciate the beauties of fall, go over by Deady Hall for a look at one tree in all its glory. A gorgeous sight.

Headline of the Week dept.: Eugene Women Seeks Injunction on Bods. (Oregon Journal)

Letters to the Editor

Emerald Editor:
Three cheers for Pete Edwards' much needed and well stated comments and suggestions on the art of being a yell leader.

His article was in the same taste as the numerous comments not at all imperceptible heard up in the stands during games. I feel as Mr. Edwards does about our fine team and well performing band; and I wish I could say the same for the yell leaders who have proved themselves to be "cute" individuals, in front of several thousand students, totally lacking in organization, enthusiasm and that fine Oregon spirit.

Bernard E. Fipp
Soph., Architecture

Emerald Editor:
Mr. Carlson is at it again, I see, in his Monday editorial. He states that our current Red China policy is untenable; therefore, we must let Mao into the U.N. I will agree on the problem, but not the conclusion. There is no reason to believe that Mao would become any more trustworthy, responsible or peaceful if this were done. I base my judgement on the record of the Soviet Union in keeping promises, which is a very poor one. The Kremlin has not

stopped its aggression since the U.N. was founded in 1945; if anything, they have increased it.

Since Communist doctrine plainly states that agreements with non-Communists are made only for propaganda and expedience, and may be broken whenever convenient, it is wise to be cautious when dealing with the Reds. Nor will they concede anything important in international wrangling. Sometimes they create crises at will (as in Berlin) to give them major bargaining points that are really fictitious; otherwise they convince us that those unimportant concessions they do make are of major interest.

Carlson also seems to ignore the facts stated in William Morrow's AP news analysis column, which I am pleased to find in the Emerald; Mr. Morrow seems to be quite aware. These facts are, for those who don't remember, that Red China and all the Soviet satellites continually stress leadership of the Soviet Union in Communist affairs, as indeed all good Communists must. (Tito is not a good Communist, at least not in this respect.)

There are too many people today who, somewhat naively optimistic, see an imminent

break between Mao and Khrushchev. I only wish this were true, but I fear it is not; and there is no reason to act on this basis, as long as American foreign policy continues to be purely defensive. Perhaps if the U.S.A. took a real offensive in fighting Communism instead of continually being forced to back down, progress would be made—but that is another story.

Finally, the most important reason for keeping Red China out of the U.N. lies with the "neutral" world, in Africa and free Asia. Most of these countries are neutral not because of ideological differences with the West, for in general they are in accord with our political ideology, but because they do not wish to become involved in a struggle that is unlikely to benefit them if they enter it. If Red China is admitted to the U.N., these people are going to feel let down, making them just that much easier prey for the Communists, who do not have any qualms about taking over governments by force. This can be confirmed by talking with people from such places as Hong Kong, India, free Southeast Asia, and almost any African nation.

John C. Champion
Junior in Biology