

Speaker Ban

"Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the Government's purposes are beneficent. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evil-minded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well-meaning, but without understanding."—Justice of the Supreme Court Louis D. Brandeis, 1928.

There are those who would argue that the above statement could be applied to the bill for a speaker ban at state colleges introduced Wednesday in the Oregon State Legislature. We believe those veterans who sought to have the bill introduced are well-meaning. We will never forget a conversation we had with a veteran of the Korean War during the Gus Hall controversy last year. He spoke bitterly of "friends dying in order to allow a man like Hall to speak at the University of Oregon."

But the lack of understanding of such veterans is also apparent. If fighting Communism is their aim, they must realize where the battleground lies. It is within the minds of men. And they must also realize that fighting on this battleground requires an understanding of the weapons needed. They would fight the battle by keeping inquiring minds from being exposed to the ideas of Communism. We would not.

A man, exposed only to ideas which reinforce his beliefs, is much less able to deal with ideas that finally come before him contrary to his own. The man who has been forced to test his beliefs against strong opposition, who is cognizant of what he is fighting against, will, by definition, be more able to defend his belief. And the defenders of a nation and its ideals will be much stronger if they have a clear understanding of what they are fighting for and against. It is time for those who fight Communism by seeking to censor information about it to realize they are opposing their own ends.

Communism is a political fact of life. If we ignore it, it won't go away. If students are confronted with it, they can better understand its fallacies. If they do not find fallacies in the system, then that is a chance we must take in a free society.

But what about those who would prohibit men from speaking here on the basis that they are criminals. Take, for instance, William Walsh, president of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, and a man we respect highly. Wednesday he said, "I favor the bill if it relates to a person who is representing a subversive organization and is speaking in their behalf." He added, "My objection last year to Gus Hall's appearance was on the grounds that he was a convicted criminal. . ."

Walsh, we believe, should take a second look at his statement. Because Mr. Hall was a convicted criminal, did that make what he had to say any more or less valuable at an educational institution?

Hall was not, at the time he spoke here, under indictment from the Federal Subversives Activities Control Board, nor was he barred, under law, from publicly airing his views. Because a man has been accused of a crime, should that prevent him from being free to speak as he sees fit.

There are also those who say that there is no need for speakers on Communism at this University. True there are a number of books dealing with the subject in the library. But books have a second-handness that lacks the immediacy of an idea which is presented verbally to a student.

Finally, the issue of freedom of speech is involved. Democracy, in theory, is founded on a belief that the people are wise enough to discover the truth in a given issue. This is why historically we have allowed criminals and Communists to

speak. Perhaps it is a sentimental view, even foolhardy. Yet it is certainly no worse than the idea that men should be prevented from speaking at a University because their beliefs are considered dangerous and, perhaps convincing.

When Gus Hall appeared here, University President Arthur S. Flemming and the faculty made us proud to be students of the University. We can think of no act which enhanced this University in the eyes of educators and the educated more than the decision to establish a speaker policy consistent with the ideal of free speech.

The individuals who had the bill introduced in the Legislature believe it will pass. The members of the legislative committee it is in believe it may make it out of the committee onto the floor of the house and senate. If that time comes we hope that students and faculty of this University will bring all the pressure they can to see that this bill, which can only damage the educational quality of this state, does not pass.

Closed Week Needed?

We reprint the following editorial from the February 6 issue of the Washington Daily. Although not necessarily in agreement with the conclusions it reaches, we believe some of the comments it makes are particularly pertinent to the coming week at the University which concludes with finals on Saturday.

It only takes one quarter at the University to realize the importance of finals week.

If professors are going to emphasize their final tests as much as they have in the past, it is time something was done to aid the students who have to take them.

Why not get rid of that hectic week before finals?

Unfortunately this week has traditionally become a tension-filled rush of mass academic activity for most students.

It never seems to fail that professors suddenly realize they are four weeks behind in a course and assign all the reading to be done the last week to catch up.

Then there are term papers due the last day of class, and those last math assignments and lab reports have to be done.

Of course there are always those professors who think it is a good idea to squeeze in just one more midterm that week.

By the time students finish the mad rush of last week assignments, they are already beginning to suffer the first effects of academic battle fatigue.

Then all they have to do is review texts, notes, outside readings and old tests for three or more classes. Coffee, cigars and pills are consumed in mass amounts as everyone fights to stay awake "just an hour longer to review that last chapter."

Soon they're nothing but walking IBM machines hopefully full of grade-winning knowledge to be sleepily scratched down on a couple of notebooks. It's certainly not the best state to be in when 30 per cent or more of one's grade depends on that last big test.

If the week before finals were looked upon as a week of lectures only with no term papers or reports due, no assignments made and no midterms given, students could properly prepare for the all-telling exams that decide how many grade points they will receive on their official transcript.

Such a Stop Week, as it is called at other universities, would be a welcome addition to the academic traditions of the University. Both students and professors would benefit.



ANGLER

Letters to the Editor

Evaluation of Arguments Emerald Editor:

With reference to the letter of Mr. Bandak, the secretary of the Arab Students' Organization, and the reply by Mr. Toor, the instructor in English, I would like to give a brief comment. First, I have nothing to do with either party. Mr. Bandak gave a brief definition of the policy of Arab Nationalism, as any other political institution which should have some kind of policy, and it is up to whom it may concern to accept or reject the policy. However, Mr. Toor's comment seems to be below the standard of an instructor in this institution to ignore the belief of millions of people by using "dirty politics" by means of such phrases as "meaningless gibberish and double talk . . . hypocrisies and fallacies", and so on. If each human individual describes the belief of every people in the way of the English instructor, then human society cannot exist. I hope that Mr. Toor can explain the method of testing the validity of his statement. I would like to ask Mr. Toor if he has spent the weekend, at least, in Egypt to observe the political, cultural, and social change that is taking place. I have the statistical data on the facts of this change.

I do not find any mention in Mr. Bandak's letter about Nasser, Isreal, Eichmann, or Nazism. What do these things have to do with what Mr. Bandak wrote? Arab Nationalism means more than meaningfulness or sense to millions of the Arabs, and there is no obligation on any body to believe it or not; it is rather an individual matter.

Mr. Toor develops a "we feeling" in his comment, and I wonder; who are the "we" that he represents, the English department, the University of Oregon, the American nation, or a certain interest group? The critical analysis of Mr. Toor shows poor judgment, and it is clearly a value judgment.

Ann McDonald
Junior—Education

End the Draft

Emerald Editor:

Do you young men 17-18 years old, who hope to plan a career now . . . Do you college teachers hoping to have dedicated men among your students . . . Do you girls who should be able to meet a variety of fellows as marriage years approach. . .

Know that the draft will expire June of 1963? And that Legislation to extend the draft will be considered in Congress very soon? If you believe that the draft should be ended your voice needs to be heard today.

Some of the nation's leaders have this to say:

Adlai Stevenson. The draft interferes with the advanced training of many young men and ulti-

mately weakens the real security and strength of our nation. I think I speak for every person in America, that we will count it a better day when we find that these military needs can best be met by a system which does not mean the disruption of the lives of an entire generation of young men; which lets them plan their education and get started more quickly along life's ordained course.

Senator Mike Mansfield. An armed service of professionals cannot be built by conscription. As in any profession there must be a certain amount of incentive. The current situation in the branches of the armed services gives very little incentive to a young man to make a career.

Prof. John Galbraith, Harvard University. The draft survives principally as a device by which we use compulsion to get young men to serve at less than the market rate of pay. Presumably freedom of choice here as elsewhere would be worth paying for . . . a shift from compulsion to fully paid service would give us a better trained force—something that modern weapons make most desirable.

If you want your opinion heard write to: President John F. Kennedy, The White House, Washington 25, D.C.

Senator Wayne Morse, Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D.C.

Representative Robert Duncan, House Office Building, Washington 25, D.C.

Further information may be obtained by writing "End the Draft in '63", P.O. Box 2548, Washington 13, D.C.

Jeanne Kenyon
Phyllis Thomas
72 W. 26th Ave., Eugene,

Wise Selection

Emerald Editor:

The Emerald Footnote concerning Gary McCormack's election to the Senate (Mon. Feb. 25th) is an example, in my opinion, of the Emerald being dead wrong. The footnote stated in part:

"But we were very surprised that the Senate decided after five minutes of questioning, by a vote of 14-11 that they would rather have him (McCormack) than an ex-student body president of Vassar on the senate."

(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 opinions of the ASUO or the University.

RON BUEL, Editor
MARTY KETELS, Business Manager