

Campus Chest

A Good System For a Worthy Cause

The annual Campus Chest charity drive, which begins today, deserves, and will probably get, the support of the University community.

The purpose of this drive, one of the few held each year on the campus, has been expressed many times in the past. It is designed to obtain charity donations from the people associated with the University, without the campus being deluged with appeals for money from all sorts of organizations throughout the year.

One interesting feature of this year's Campus Chest drive is that many students are familiar with Pearl Buck School, one of the recipients. The school for retarded children has frequently benefitted from projects and children's parties sponsored by

fraternities and sororities.

This year, at least 10 per cent of the money collected will be given to Pearl Buck School, and the remainder will be given to Eugene United Appeal to be allocated as that organization's officials think best.

This is a good way for the drive to be organized, for apart from knowing of one deserving organization, we are in no position to judge the relative merits of all the others pleading for assistance. We can leave that matter in the hands of the experts.

Thus, the structure of Campus Chest makes it possible for the University students to help an organization which they know deserves help, and contribute to more removed charities as well.



"BEWARE, FOR DREADFUL IS THE WRATH OF KINGS."
(Homer)

UO—Friendly or No?

One of the most priceless features of the University is its foreign student population. The exchange of ideas stimulated by these people, and the cosmopolitan atmosphere they lend to this campus are invaluable in many ways.

Elias K. Zain, a doctorate student in secondary education from the Republic of Lebanon took an "accidental sample" of 100 of these University foreign students last Spring. Of this 100, 80 came from Asia. Zain was particularly interested in the attitudes toward these foreign students, as seen by themselves.

Perhaps the most revealing figure was the number of intimate American friends they had found while here. Most of them, 63, said they had one or more intimate friends, but 37 said they had no intimate friends at all.

More than half, 59, of the single students interviewed had dated, but of the 12 single students interviewed, 10 did not date at all.

As for invitations, 83 reported invitations to a meal, and a little over half, 53,

reported to have been invited to speak to a group.

When asked, "Have professors made adjustments in their courses to make things easier for you, 52 had received adjustments, and the rest opposed any such adjustments, expressing the desire to be treated equally with American students.

Concerning general campus attitude, 80 indicated they knew students who were friendly, and 86 said they had professors who were friendly.

From these figures, two conclusions can be drawn. First, that, on the surface, the University of Oregon is a fairly friendly place for a foreign student to go to school.

Secondly, that there are still many foreign students on campus who do not make close friends and who find their stay here lonely and unpleasant.

It is this latter group of foreign students which should be of concern to those people on campus who recognize the importance of communication among nations.

Letters to the Editor

Reporters Try Hard

Emerald Editor:

Reporters try hard. Sometimes they do not listen well. I want to correct two statements made in the Emerald's report of my "Last Lecture" in which I contended that teachers ought to lecture less and ought to use the Socratic method more.

First, your reporter reported that I said that "The teacher in a Socratic class acts only as moderator." This is not what I said. I said that the teacher in a "Socratic class" acts as moderator part of the time and part of the time he also participates actively in the discussion.

Second, your reporter reported that I said that "... lecture classes only impart information ..." This is not what I said. What I said was that lectures tend only to impart information. Obviously, the lecturer might try to do a number of different things in his lecture. I also stressed that insofar as it is the aim of the lecturer to impart information he cannot be very successful; students do not remember very long.

Finally, your reporter did not report anything on the last one-third of my talk in which I tried to set forth and refute arguments to the effect that the Socratic method of teaching cannot be effectively used outside the law school classroom. To summarize: some say classes are too big—the Socratic method will not work in classes larger than twenty-five or thirty students. This is false. I have seen the method work well in classes of one-hundred and fifty. Then, too, we should not assume that the only students who are participating are those who participate actively—there is such a thing as vicarious participation. Some argue that students cannot be motivated to take part in class. This is false. It is also a defeatist attitude. Resourceful teachers can draw students into the discussion, and teachers ought to be resourceful. Some argue that if you define narrow points and argue about them, it will not be possible to cover much ground. I agree. But coverage is not important. To the extent that coverage is thought to be important, and to the extent that the teacher thinks he has something to add to what is said in the textbook, the teacher can mimeograph the material and hand it out. The lecture went out with the invention of the printing press and mimeograph machines. Finally, some argue that the Socratic method can only be used to teach legal materials. This is false. In my talk I tried to show how the method could be used to teach a class in history, a class in

Shakespeare, and a class in chemistry.

The chief aim of a liberal education is to develop critical judgment. In my experience, lecturing is not the way to do this. I do not think you can teach critical judgment. I do think you can expose the students to a process that will require that they do some critical thinking. For lack of a better word, we may call this process "Socratic".

Robert S. Summers
Assistant Professor of Law

Severe Language

Emerald Editor:

I am aware that many may object to the severity of my language; but is there not cause for severity? I will be as harsh as truth, and as uncompromising as justice. On this subject, I do not wish to think, or speak, or write with moderation. No! No! Tell a man whose house is on fire, to give a moderate alarm; tell him to moderately rescue his wife from the hands of the ravisher; tell the mother to gradually extricate her babe from the fire into which it has fallen;—but urge me not to use moderation in a cause like the present. I am in earnest—I will not equivocate—I will not excuse—I will not retreat a single inch—AND I WILL BE HEARD.

If the fraternities have violated the rules concerning hazing, close them!

William Lloyd Garrison
Graduate Student

Letters to the Editor

Pro-Bridges

Emerald Editor:

I was appalled by your attempt in Wednesday's editorial to equate a possible appearance by Harry Bridges with that of Gus Hall. Far from being the avowed leader of the Communist Party of the United States, he was no less than five times (if memory serves me correctly) beaten off attempts by the Government to deport him on the grounds that he was a Communist. Mr. Bridges, (who, by the way, is a registered Republican and supported Nixon in 1960) has been a leading figure in the Trade Union movement for many years, and his appearance on this campus would certainly be of benefit. As for its not being good "public relations", I see no reason why this University should "sterilize" itself during appropriations time on the chance that some legislators in Salem might get upset.

After your recent editorials on free speech and intellectual attainment, I am surprised that you attempt a thinly veiled smear the minute you are faced with the possibility of a speaker whose views are, admittedly, unconventional. By mentioning Bridges and Hall in the same breath, you obviously intended to discredit the former by innuendo. (Don't misunderstand, I see nothing wrong with Communists speaking here either.) In addition, your patronizing

remarks about YD "sincerity" did not serve to lessen the smear. All in all, I feel that your editorial constituted a real disservice to free speech on this campus.

Gregory F. Bachelis
Graduate Assistant,
Mathematics

Pleased Reader

Emerald Editor:

I was very pleased to find someone speaking out on this matter of inviting controversial people to this campus. People like Gus Hall and Harry Bridges only tend to confuse us. And very likely they are the cause of all this student apathy that people are talking about. Instead, what we really need are more religious programs and a new football stadium. Wouldn't it be wonderful to see that new stadium just packed with all nine thousand of us yelling our hearts out for the team? These are the kind of spirited students that America needs. So let's not permit these people and their foreign ideas to distract us from our more wholesome activities.

Ronald Horn
Senior in Sociology

Limited Viewpoint

Emerald Editor:

In a letter in Wednesday's Emerald, George Davis appears to number himself among those who would reject a university because of ill feeling toward one

staff member, avoid a political party because of personal dislike for some of its advocates, and turn away from a religion because of grievances concerning its adherents.

Christians are often (not always, unfortunately) among the first to admit that excesses have been committed in the name of Christianity. To quote our friend (who attributes these to Christianity, rather than more accurately to individual Christians), it "curses all forms of earthly pleasure, preaches tradition for the sake of tradition ..." If he really believes that such misinterpretations are the heart of Christianity, he is sadly misinformed. He perhaps is also unaware that Christians don't believe that human beings are perfect, but that they do make mistakes. (This is, in fact, one of the features that makes Christianity unique among religions.)

Incidentally, I was not under the impression that the purpose of Religious Emphasis Week was to proselytize for any particular religion. The activities of this week might not have enlightened our misguided friend, who had already so thoroughly rejected religion, but might at least have stimulated his thinking in the direction of something other than his own limited viewpoint.

Sarah W. Wing
Graduate Student,
Psychology

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 opinions of the ASUO of the University.

RON BUEL, Editor
MARTY KETELS, Business Manager
TED MAHAR, Managing Editor
EVERETTE DENNIS, News Editor
PHIL COGSWELL, Editorial Page Editor
LARRY WILLIAMS, Advertising Manager
LARRY GRAVES, Sports Editor
DULCY MORAN, Assistant Managing Editor
DAVE SANDS, **JIM FRAKE**, **JANET GOETZE**, Assistant News Editors
GEORGE BIGHAM, Photo Editor
LINDA BROWN, Entertainment Editor
RON COWAN, **CATHY NEVILLE**, **THORA WILLIAMS**, Associate News Editors
EDITORIAL BOARD:
Ron Buel, Phil Cogswell, Ted Mahar, Everett Dennis, Dave Sands, Dulcy Moran, Linda Brown, Bob Forsyth, Grant Ledgerwood, Don Ragen, Janet Goetze, and Bill Hestichson