

Election Reform

Now that the smoke has cleared from the freshman election and everyone can lean back and objectively view the results, we would like to make a few comments about the ASUO election board and the problems which are now facing its jurisdiction.

THERE ARE THREE basic flaws which become evident from the experience of this fall term election. The first of these is the difficulty the board must face in enforcing its rules right down to the letter. The candidate's word must be believed in almost every case because it is next to impossible to check each purchase made by each candidate in the race.

Anyone can report that he has spent less than the expenditure limit.

SECONDLY, it must be decided how strong the board's punitive measures should be. If a candidate were to go a nickel over the limit set by the board, would he be disqualified or is some other less drastic punishment in order? In other words, the board must make a definite decision as to how close the expenditure limit should be adhered to by the candidates.

Another factor, which results in the third problem, is the possibility of another party seeking the elimination of a candidate by spending money for that candidate while claiming good intentions.

THE ELECTIONS board is stuck with the expense limit. The difficulties in the fall

election are the natural result of experimentation of a new system. We would like to see the elections board learn from the mistakes which showed up in the election and define the system more clearly for the spring election.

The board should make it quite clear exactly what will and will not be considered campaign expenses. For instance, the board must decide what to do with expenses incurred during coke dates which are used to influence female votes. Should gas used in cars in the noise parades be counted as an expense? Is it fair for some candidates to obtain materials of equal value for less money than their opponents because of influence or connections they possess? The problem of gifts should also be resolved. That is, must materials given to the candidates free of expense be included in the candidates' expense account?

ALONG THIS LINE the board should decide what to do when a fraternity house buys materials and then gives them to its candidates free of cost.

These questions boil down to this: should the money spent for or by the candidate be the "expenses incurred" or should the actual value of the candidate's campaign be considered.

We hope the elections board will either find solutions to the problems which arose during and after the fall elections or seek to change the system.

The American Negro

(Editor's note: The following article is the second in a series taken from the Daily Kansan, University of Kansas.)

The Supreme Court decision of 1954 baffled the Negro. After centuries of indoctrination in the spirit of inferiority, he was slow to assert himself. He could not fully realize that the decision of the court represented the apex of a century-old movement toward racial tolerance as a guaranteed right. The Negro looked about him fearfully and hesitated long—but at last he began to act.

THERE WERE THOSE of his race who had studied integration in detail, preparing themselves for this day. They were his leaders. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People led the assault on the bastions of prejudice. They did not seek so much to change attitudes as to force them to conform with the decision of the court. They felt, and still feel, that if equal opportunity and the removal of conditions which lead to feelings of inferiority became reality, then hostile attitudes could be overcome. But they said this last could not be done unless equality and integration in the broad sense were established, even though protests were vehement.

The NAACP was aggressive. Its lawyers brought scores of cases before the bar in many states, and began to extend the court decision to any and all matters involving separation of the races. Often they were wrong, or their accusations were unfair; but they also exposed many an injustice.

The South, its heritage and entire way of life threatened in the eyes of its citizens, fought back. The Klu Klux Klan, long dead as an influence in the South, enjoyed a brief revival, but soon lapsed back into virtual inactivity. The people of the South had advanced beyond use of the Klan as an acceptable arm of action. Instead, the communities of the South organized White Citizen's Committees, dedicated to the idea that the mixing of the races was unnatural and evil and contending that the Supreme Court overstepped its bounds in forcing on the people of one area a decision that they alone had the right to make. Some of these committees operated with perfect sincerity

and conviction; others became sounding boards for men like John Kasper, who hid sick hatred for the Negro behind a veil of states-rightisms and implications of racial inferiority ordained by the almighty. All of them led their communities in maintaining segregation in the face of mounting pressure. The battle was joined.

IT WAS NOT LONG before the massed power of the federal judiciary and executive branches began to weigh on the South. In 1955, the Supreme Court reaffirmed its decision of the previous year, and warned that the law at all levels must be made to conform to the idea set down by the original decision. This reaffirmation led to a procession of cases brought before the courts, cases involving segregation in eating places, on public transit systems, and, of course, in schools. The South (and parts of the North) were watching their powers of self-determination chipped away by the court. Tension increased.

In 1957, schools in Little Rock, Ark., were shut down in a desperate attempt to forestall integration. In Virginia, Gov. J. Lindsay Almond, declaring he would never permit integration, slammed the doors of schools in that state in the faces of the pupils. There had been a brief lull in the advance of integration, but now the choice was clear—integration forced upon the South by the government, or failure of the government to enforce it, leaving the field to the individual states in matters involving separation of the races.

Footnotes

Not to be outdone by the United States Olympic team, Oregon cross-country men will leave Saturday morning with torches in their hands for Oregon Cow College. The last two men will carry the torch 10 miles. That is a long ways.

Maybe it would be a good idea if all of us would run over there and all the Oregon Cow students would run over here.

That way everyone would be so tired there would be no danger of the vandalism which sometimes accompanies Civil Wars.

Little Man on Campus



"SINCE YOU COME TO OUR FOOTBALL GAMES — WE JUST THOUGHT WE'D RESPOND BY SHOWING A LITTLE INTEREST IN THE ART DEPARTMENT!"

Prof Rates Other Props: Names Three Categories

(Reprinted from the Ohio State University Lantern.)

By **CHARLES B. WHEELER**
Assistant Professor of English

Wynken, Blynken, and Nod are the names I shall give the three professors on this campus whose portraits are briefly sketched here. The men are fictitious but not imaginary.

BY A long-standing tacit agreement, every student who enrolls in one of Professor Wynken's courses is spotted a "C" to begin with, and only in cases of flagrant absence or failure to turn in assigned written work is there any danger of a lower grade. "A's" and "B's" are common.

Professor Wynken is not a fool: he knows that his students, by and large, are nothing to get excited about, but he is a kindly man who believes in live-and-let-live. He is also a great sports fan and unsparing in his criticism of sloppy playing on the football field. Luckily for his peace of mind, our athletic department enforces the highest standards of performance.

PROFESSOR BLYNKEN is not the drooling petty sadist portrayed in "Little Man on Campus," but he manages to harass his students quite as effectively by simply being obtuse to their feeling. He never stops to make sure that his assignments have been understood after he gives them.

When he lectures he goes so rapidly that note-takers are left hopelessly behind, and when he holds a class discussion it usually turns into a tete-a-tete between himself and some favored student. He adheres to his office hours so literally that he is almost inaccessible.

THOUGH he insists that papers be turned in on time, he never returns them when promised. He habitually comes into class late and then holds it with his glittering eye until 30 seconds before the final bell for the next hour. He is a very prominent man in his field.

Professor Nod is not a boring lecturer, droning over dog-eared lecture notes compiled twenty years ago. His method is entirely different. It may be called "teaching the text," that is, sitting in front of the class

and reciting the text out loud, with interpolated comments, while the students slump, numb and disgusted, working on their arithmetic under pretense of reading the Lantern.

HE NEVER assigns papers that require more than a sentence or two of consecutive original writing, and the papers are returned bearing grades but no marks or comments on their faults. He will pass illiterate writing if the technical content is satisfactory.

He is very fond of multiple-choice tests, though now and then he will extend himself by giving a short-answer test to see how well the students have memorized "facts" (a word that he would never dream of putting in quotation marks.) He believes that his courses are intellectually demanding.

THESE men are faculty failures. They are not localized in any one department or college—they can be found all over the campus. Perhaps we faculty members might turn, for a change, from criticizing the shortcomings of our students to considering how far short we fall of meeting the challenge that they present.

This challenge is not only in their numbers: it is in their seriousness, their receptivity, their candor, it is in their woe-ful inexperience, their confused aims, their clumsiness at abstract thought—all their qualities, good and bad, call for the best in us. We cannot succeed with less.

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 CHANTRY, Women's Editor
DAVE SANDS, Photo Editor
FRED CRAFTS, Entertainment Editor
EDITORIAL BOARD
Kernan Turner, Ted Mahar, Keith Powell, Al Hynding, Marge Langenes, Fred Crafts, Jim Boyd, Ron Buel, Gary Sala, Howard McGlasson, Sue Hunter.