

Little Man on Campus

Majority Report

(Editor's note: In an attempt to give a well-rounded analysis of Wednesday's Charter Day Convocation attendance, we have allowed two opposing viewpoints of editorial board members to be viewed here. The titles of the editorials are significant.)

Certain dormitory officials put one over on the freshmen Wednesday by tricking them into attending the Charter Day convocation. Dormitory students, both male and female, were assigned gates in which to enter McArthur court and were told that their dormitory counselors would be waiting there to see which students attended. One dormitory counselor reports that roll was actually taken.

THE PUNISHMENT, either actually threatened or inferred, was to be a trip to one of the dormitory officials' offices for a little chat.

This action seems harmless enough since every freshman should attend the Charter Day activities. Those freshmen who did attend were very impressed with the pomp of the occasion from what we have been able to determine.

But what about the University's policy towards its students? Generally the University administration has adopted the attitude that students are adults when they come to the University and should be treated as such.

EACH FACULTY member, for example, makes his own class attendance rules. While there is no official poll, it would probably be safe to say that the majority of the faculty feel that it is the student's responsibility to attend. The same is also true of University assemblies and similar events.

This is not as true in our sister institution of the pasturelands to the north and, except for administration policy, need not be here.

But considering this long standing liberal policy, we wonder why dormitory officials suddenly took it upon themselves to change it. Traditions are fine and the tradition of attending Charter Day should be encouraged, but perhaps the tradition of treating students as mature individuals is more important.

HOWEVER, it is entirely possible that the fault does not lie entirely with those dormitory officials who instigated the piece of trickery. Much of the fault lies with those students whose anticipated lack of interest prompted the event.

Perhaps, though, in the long run the greatest damage will have been done to the prestige of the dormitory system itself. What respect can a system expect if a rule is promulgated one day and retracted the next?

What happens if later this year it is necessary to yell wolf again?

Minority Report

For once in the history of Charter Day a decent sized audience attended. It's about time enough students showed up to give the impression that students are interested in something other than the chances of a date with a Carson girl.

GRANTED, NOT EVERYONE showed up of his own accord. A little coercion was necessary on the part of the dorm counselors. For girls roll was taken, and for boys dorm counselors were waiting at the gates to see who didn't show up. The penalty for not attending was for girls a conference with the assistant director of dormitories; there was no penalty whatever for boys.

Maybe there should have been. If students are so indifferent to their University, perhaps they have no place here.

It is true that we come here to learn and that attending Charter Day will not help

any classwork. People do not come to school for a lot of horsing around with traditions and ceremonies.

OR DO THEY? CERTAINLY no one spends his entire college career behind books. Everyone makes it over to the SU once in awhile. In fact, some people make it away from the SU only once in awhile. Certainly the movie houses are not suffering from lack of student attendance. Somehow it seems that people who have time for social activities and other extra-curricular diversions should have time to attend Charter Day ceremonies; especially when they are excused from class expressly for that purpose.

The only unfortunate aspect of the "forcing" of dorm residents to attend the convocation is that the forcing was necessary.



"BUT TH' COACH TOLD US TO START MAKIN' MORE USE OF TH' LIBERRY."

Howard McGlasson

Two Voting Groups Make Election Outcome Unclear

There are two groups existing now which make an early forecast of the presidential election outcome impossible. They are the non-voting registered voters and the switch-party voters.

THERE IS A movement, particularly in California, to abstain from presidential balloting, mostly because of a feeling that neither candidate is suitable for the position. This movement has been featured in a leading magazine, The Saturday Review. With this abstaining population of voters in many states, which may include voters who will fail to decide which candidate they want by Nov. 6, forecasts of individual states are impossible. It is the electorally powerful states that are active in this campaign. It was started approximately two to three months ago and has been growing in momentum since. Hence, this facet creates a stigma in election forecasts and election actions more than any other factor viewable to this writer. It causes a catering to this group from both candidates and hence an unsurity of position in both camps.

ANOTHER VARIABLE that can make early poll tabulation a grade A headache is that of the register-one-way-vote-another-way voter. This is something that can best be shown by the example of California. In California the majority of registered voters are Democratic, and have been for the past two presidential elections. Yet the state has voted for the Republican nominee in the two previous elections and is expected to present their vote to Mr. Nixon. There are many states where this is the rule. Extreme cases are the southern states which have almost a 60 per cent to 75 per cent majority of Democratic registration and yet seem to be tending to the Republicans and have in the past two elections.

THERE ARE several factors that contribute to this tendency. First, these voters tend to exercise their freedom of choice and deviate from party lines during a presidential election more than at any other time. At this time conservative Democrats and liberal Republicans

will shift to the other party if their party goes too far from what they believe is right and the opposing party sticks to what is closer to their political beliefs. At this time this kind of voter keeps his respective registration but votes for the opposite party's candidate. This exertion of freedom is one that can be quite disturbing to the political analysis and result in several dozen headaches.

Another reason for this switch in vote and continuance of party is that people are reluctant to break a tradition — such as registering in one party. This is sometimes called "operational apathy" because of years of accepting party affiliation without the responsibilities and participation that supposedly come with registration. This could be nicknamed "rutism," but perhaps this is too smutty a tag. It exists, this complacency, and it is only a part of human nature, for once we are accustomed to something, the habit is hard to break.

POLITICS TODAY are also more non-partisan than they were 20 years ago. This means that party lines are not so frigid and forbearing as they were before. Politics have become, in most cases more statesmanlike, and perhaps this very fact is the crux of the entire discussion here presented: both non-voting registered voters and party-switching voters are, to this

(Continued on page 3)

Letters to the Editor

Emerald Editor:

Congratulations on selecting the editorial under "Our Contemporaries" that appeared in Wednesday's Emerald. Although the candidates' religious beliefs, financial status, public speaking ability, and poise may be of interest to the general public, they should not be elevated to major issues in the campaign.

Tom Hoyt,
Sophomore, Pre Law.

Emerald Editor:

Like many other loyal Democrats, I hurried over to the library the other evening after the last Nixon-Kennedy debate, intent upon checking the records of any possible use of earthy language in recent times by high ranking Republicans.

I FELT that the diggings in this mine must surely be rich in view of all irritations and reverses that Republicans have suffered in recent years—ranging from such petty annoyances as the cessation of the flow of gifts and favors from industrial-

ist Goldfine, to the blow up of so many of their most important projects such as the Dixon-Yates Power deal, the Vanguard I rocket, the Al Serena timber mine, the Paris summit conference, the president's visits to Russia and Japan, our paternal relationship with Cuba, and so forth.

Our library staff prides itself on the completeness of the subject indexes, bibliographic and cross reference system. It is their contention that you can find information on anything—yes, anything, there. So it was with a confident smile that I approached the card catalog.

FIRST, I TRIED to find the information under the general heading "Republicans." This seemed promising as there was a whole tray and a half of cards. However I could find no sub-heads such as "Republicans-use of profanity by," "Republicans—colorful language of," etc., though I tried every such lead I could think of.

Perhaps, I thought, the information desired would more log-

ically be assembled under the general heading "Profanity," under some such arrangement as "Profanity—presidential," "Profanity—senatorial," "Profanity—Republican," etc., but it turned out that there was only a small handful of cards in this category, none of them relevant to my problem.

I did, however, run across an intriguing little volume by S. O. Bee, entitled **Profanity Through the Ages** in which were gathered together some of the most colorful expressions from all the civilizations of the past, including such choice phrases as the ancient Egyptians, Chinese and Greek.

(Editor's note: We regret that we had to delete some Chinese writing, Egyptian hieroglyphics and Greek words—not because we fear their meaning—because our printers could not find the appropriate type.)

Soon I had forgotten all about the Republicans and was happily enriching my own vocabulary oblivious of all else when

(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.

- KERNAN R. TURNER, Editor
 - STEVE MILLIKIN, Business Manager
 - JIM BOYD, Managing Editor
 - TED MAHAR, News Editor
 - LOUIS TURK, Advertising Manager
 - DULCY MORAN, KEITH POWELL, Assistant News Editors
 - AL HYNDING, RON BUEL, Sports Editors
 - BARBARA CHANDRY, Women's Editor
 - DAVE SANDS, Photo Editor
 - FRED CRAFTS, Entertainment Editor
- EDITORIAL BOARD
- Kernan Turner, Ted Mahar, Keith Powell, Al Hynding, Marge Langness, Fred Crafts, Jim Boyd, Ron Buel, Gary Sala, Howard McGlasson, Sue Hunter.