

Little Man on Campus

Progress Report

Progress is Made by Student and Faculty,
Not the Construction Company

A giant new complex of dormitories was occupied for the first time this fall. More units will be ready for next fall. A new book co-op opened its doors also this fall. Plans are under way for multi-million dollar building projects including a new football stadium and a humanities building. So many high school seniors want to attend the University that a deferred admission plan will have to be put into effect this fall. Obviously, building and enrollment progress is booming at the University. This is a fine time for the Emerald to publish its Progress Edition.

BUT NO MATTER what progress is announced later on plans for the new building projects, the most progressive thing that will have happened all year was the allowing of Communist Gus Hall to speak on the campus.

Even more heartening than the construction of a new humanities building, was the establishment of the Honors College in 1960.

These two events hardly make the University of Oregon the Harvard of the West. But it is an encouraging sign that so many students took advantage of the opportunity to hear Hall. It is also encouraging that on the whole the Honors College has been as successful as it has. This interest indicates that some students are progressing toward the goal of academic interest, which is the first step toward excellence, and academic freedom.

Merely because a university builds a certain number of dormitories during any given year does not make it a necessarily great institution. More relevant is the number of students living in those dormitories who have been moved by a good instructor or an eye-opening class to read a book not on the required reading list. More relevant than the number of books the new book store can house is the number of books that are read perceptively.

JUST AS THERE may be those who judge progress by a record-high construction budget, to some perhaps the value of college lies in the number of hours they can do the twist ("We're pretty serious about it"), the number of kegs they tap, and the number of hearts they break. Occasionally, there's a mid-term or paper. Don't sweat it.

DO SWEAT IT. When students start sweating about something besides Friday's heavy date, then perhaps real progress will be made toward what a university should be.

It is unrealistic to expect a mass exodus from basement party room to the library, nor is it desirable. But one of the things that the progressive university should do would be to give the students a certain perspective. It is this perspective that allows a student to listen carefully to, whether or not agreeing with, a Gus Hall. It is a perspective that enables the student to see the value of tapping the keg as well as turning out a first-class term paper.

The progressive university gives the student, not automatically, but sometimes necessarily painfully, this perspective to weigh, to evaluate.

To some, on the other hands, the value of college degree may never be more than a supposedly sure-fire guarantee to a corporation first vice-presidency. To others perhaps it is a glorious four-year merry-go-round of flapdoodle and tomfoolery. But a progressive liberal education should give the student a view of life as well as a view of a multi-million dollar student housing project. It should give him the perspective to see the value in a speech by Gus Hall, in the Honors College core curriculum, and a Twist-a-Thon. As more Oregon students have this view, the closer Oregon will come to being a great university. The progress will be made more by the students and faculty than by construction companies.



Senators' Forum

Senate and Students Must Work Together

By NEIL GOLDSCHMIDT
ASUO Senator-at-Large

With great numbers of specific problems—if not grievances—yet to be resolved, it is tempting for one given the opportunity to express his views through this University's most effective mass medium, to take the soap box in crusade for specific solutions; yet this approach would bring little understanding or satisfaction. The question which the students at this University must ask is not a specific one, such as "What are we going to do about the method proposed to finance the new football stadium?", or "How are we going to improve spirit at the athletic contest?", but rather "WHERE IS THIS UNIVERSITY HEADED IN 1962?" More specifically we must ask, "Where do we want to go in 1962?"

THE UNIVERSITY Senate is attempting to answer many varied questions with the full amount of interest and attention which vital issues deserve. But merely time and interest will never yield flexible-farsighted decisions, which will stand the test of time and serve adequately the student for whom the decisions were made. An interested student body can do much to determine the Senate's mind on issues, as well as aid its resolve and speed its decisions. In this article, I discuss student government only in its general scope, in the hope that I may aid some students to understand and construct a reliable frame of reference, or a model, against which specific problems may be measured and that active interest may be created in the wide range of student government action.

IT IS VITAL that the student body and the Senate approach all questions, not as single isolated problems, but as interrelated inseparable issues, each of which inevitably affects many others. Often the interrelationships will seem obvious, but more often the penumbra, the grayed area of overlap, is either overlooked or intentionally obscured. Examining the issues presently confronting the Oregon body, it is obvious that clouded thinking often prevails in more than a few minds. The controversy

surrounding the present consideration of construction of a new football stadium is the most recent example of presentations, both pro and con, wherein an issue is isolated from all others and reasoning becomes muddled.

The issue, for student purposes, must first be not how the stadium is financed, nor where it should be constructed. Rather, we must address ourselves to the more vital questions: 1) If the stadium is built, what responsibilities will fall upon the University as a result. 2) Are these new responsibilities (or extensions of old responsibilities) compatible with the goals of this institution. We must evaluate this proposal in light of its future effects, lest we mortgage students of future years to a transitory policy; one constructed on expediency rather than honesty. This type of soul searching will help us to avoid the "I wish we hadn't..." remarks that inevitably result when analysis on a broad scope is absent from planning. Presently those who are examining the multiple uses of expensive structures and the impact of such expenditures on finances and morale, are engaged in proper consideration of all possible ramifications of a decision; those who would do less aren't paying adequate attention to a serious matter.

There are many challenging tasks ahead, but if the Senate, conceived as the student's highest council, is to function accurately, it must, to reiterate an often stated fact, be subjected to constructive criticism and, most important, it must be given **ACTIVE SUPPORT**. The greatest threat to Senate strength will be its own failure to act with sufficient speed and judgment. If the Senate fails this test, it will become nothing.
(Continued on page 3)

OREGON DAILY EMERALD

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published seven 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.

KEITH POWELL, Editor
LEE TURNBULL, Business Manager

Letters to the Editor

Disgusted Reader

Emerald Editor:

I would like to know what your policy is on the "Little Man on Campus" cartoon; whether it's on a yearly contract basis or some shorter period.

If Bibler is attempting humor then he's either missing completely or aiming too low. Am I alone in being not merely non-plussed but a little disgusted with the LMOC?

If the cartoon can be changed I should like to nominate "Peanuts." If the contract cannot be broken could the cartoon at least be relegated to a less dignified position (e.g. beside the sick ramblings of Ted Mahar's advertisements).

Bibler's 'Little Man' is really little.

Keith Jellum,
History, Junior.

* *

Discriminate

Emerald Editor:

The Off-campus Housing Office has seen fit to decide that any householder who discriminates against certain students will not be allowed to have his name listed in that office. Per-

haps now someone would like to withdraw University recognition to certain on-campus living organizations which practice more flagrant discrimination than the householders.

Ronald Starr (3.??),
Senior in Psychology.

* *

Disagrees

Emerald Editor:

Your editorial of Wednesday, Feb. 22, deploring the withering away of the Oregon Union places the blame directly and by implication upon the faculty of this University.

It seems to me that both the substance and the tone of your editorial is slanderous and generally apprehensible. (You accuse the faculty of "intellectual cowardice.")

IN THE FIRST place the faculty of this University has spoken out individually and collectively on a great number of controversial issues. In the setting of University Assemblies, of Coffee Hours, Honors College Discussions, of TV, and of the press it has expressed and debated a variety of viewpoints.

And now, your editorial

claims, the Oregon Union founders on the shoals of faculty apathy and unwillingness to see ideas examined in the open market-place.

I suggest you do some soul-searching. Wasn't the Oregon Union based on the model of the Oxford Union? Wasn't it essentially meant to be a student enterprise? Isn't it rather the lack of motivation and interest on the part of the students that keeps the Oregon Union from becoming a meaningful platform.

I think that you owe an apology to this faculty.

Lucian C. Marquis,
Assistant Professor in
Political Science.

Fight Nature

Emerald Editor:

Peoples of the world had better spend less time fighting one another and pay more attention to fighting the forces of nature, such as insects, water shortages and diminishing resources, things that have the final say about how we live.

Wm. R. Sullivan,
1116 S. Flower,
Los Angeles 15, Calif.