

Oregon Daily Emerald

Opinions expressed on the editorial page are those of the Emerald and do not necessarily represent the opinions of the ASUO or the University. However, the Emerald does present on this page columnists and letter writers whose opinions reflect those of our diverse readership and not those of the Emerald itself.

PHIL SEMAS, Editor
WILBUR BISHOP JR., Business Manager
ANNETTE BUCHANAN, Managing Editor
MIKE FANCHER, News Editor
LARRY LANGE, Associate Editor
CAROLINE PITMAN, Advertising Manager
CLIFF SANDERLIN, Editorial Page Editor
NOMI BORENSTEIN, Associate Editor

University of Oregon, Eugene, Monday, November 21, 1966

A Republican In '68? Maybe

Except for the results in California and Alabama, Tuesday's election contained some heartening signs. But things don't look too bright for those of us who had hoped for an indication that there might be a change coming in our country's bankrupt foreign policy.

In California, of course, the voters made the greatest mistake they have ever made. They put in office a conservative in moderate's clothing, a man with little understanding of the massive problems facing the state, few proposals for solving them, and with no administrative experience other than heading an actor's union. We can only hope that the idiocy that put Ronald Reagan in office will not carry over to the rest of the nation.

Alabama isn't as bad, perhaps only because it was expected. The victory of Lurleen and George is a blow against the progressive movement in the South, but it is balanced by other encouraging signs.

In Maryland, voters rejected George Mahoney, a six-time loser and segregationist candidate, in favor of Republican Spiro Agnew for governor.

In Georgia, right in the heart of the deep south, arch-segregationist Lester Maddox may win over Republican Howard "Bo" Callaway, but if he does it will be just slightly. And Mr. Callaway could just as easily win.

In Arkansas moderate Republican Winthrop Rockefeller defeated segregationist Jim Johnson.

We find the Republican resurgence somewhat heartening, not because the Republicans have much to offer but because it indicates some rejection of the man in the White House. The election means that it will be much tougher for LBJ to win in 1968. Either the Republicans may beat him outright or the Democrats may realize he is going to lose and will find a more acceptable candidate, like Robert F. Kennedy.

One reason the Republicans have a good chance of taking the White House in 1968 is that they seem more likely to nominate a candidate who will be acceptable to the American voter, though they obviously failed to do so in the last presidential election. Except for Reagan the Republicans elected mostly moderates, notably George Romney in Michigan, Chuck Percy in Illinois, Nelson Rockefeller in New York, Edward Brooke in Massachusetts, and Mark Hatfield in Oregon. That gives moderates a good possibility to put someone like Romney at the head of the ticket, instead of losers like Dick Nixon or Reagan.

So maybe we'll get Lyndon out of the White House in '68.

The man most likely to unseat Johnson is Romney. Romney's foreign policy stand hasn't even been fuzzy. It's nonexistent. Men like Percy and Hatfield are more to our liking but both are too young. And after Hatfield's lackluster performance as Oregon's governor we must question his ability to handle even the vice presidency.

If the Republicans win in 1968 there will probably be changes in domestic policy. Some of it would be good in that it may end our spiraling inflation. Some of it could be bad in that it could lessen government's commitment to solving the social problems of the nation. But it seems unlikely that there would be any kind of major shift in foreign policy.

In short, none of the presidential possibilities for 1968—except perhaps Robert Kennedy—offer the promise of any really new directions that many saw in John Kennedy.

Emerald Editor:

All letters to the editor must be typewritten and double spaced. Letters must not exceed 300 words and must be signed in ink, giving the class and major of the writer. Those dealing with one subject and pertaining to the University or Eugene community will be given preference. The Emerald reserves the right to edit letters for style, grammar, punctuation, and potentially libelous content. Letters not meeting these criteria and those which are mimeographed or otherwise obvious duplicates will be returned.

Progress

Emerald Editor:
Now that the election is over perhaps we can proceed to discuss less trivial matters in the Emerald. My own thoughts seem to be rambling more and more afield without a political burden to get in the way.

Example: Has anybody noticed that large gray squirrel with a magnificent tail near the library every morning? That tail of his—what a status symbol to squirreldom it must be; not only for balance and warmth at night, but for his general good looks as well.

Makes me think back to about 20 million years ago when our ancestors had tails. They probably spent a good deal of time beautifying them with a variety of methods. However, in the interests of practicality we have since lost our tails, moved on to other areas, and are presently in the process of losing our heads. Progress.

This is why hair has become such a modern hang up. We're compensating for the frustration of losing our tails.

Hair is all we have left. It can be rolled, flipped, twisted, teased, straightened, curled, cut, dyed, tinted, streaked, bleached, tipped, waved, set,

and generally messed up in thousands of ways for both men and women. One more example of 20th century freedom.

It's obvious that we lost quite a bit when we came down out of the trees.

Steve Immer
Graduate, History

SU Board Understands

Emerald Editor:
In regard to your editorial of November 10 concerning the Student Union Board, the Emerald seems to have several misconceptions about the board and its letter to President Fleming.

The first point I wish to clear up is that the board is not "a self-perpetuating body which is basically not responsible to the wishes of students."

The board is, like the Senate, a representative body of the students. The SU Board is representative of the students in a different way than the Senate, however; it is composed of members of the various schools, along with ASUO and faculty representatives.

It is truly representative, perhaps more than the senate. This is evidenced by the poor turnout at elections.

The SU Board has complete understanding of the proposal. Any decisions whether administrative or policy, will be delayed by passing through the Senate. If administrative decisions were suspended by the ASUO president, the delay could be hazardous because, as you say, these are decisions that have to be made quickly.

It is not so outlandish that the board might take over the Senate. The board knows what is right for the students' union; the Senate knows nothing about the SU, except what it covets from the SU, like more space

and tables all over the lobby and terrace.

Finally, the board does have an effective answer; the structure should remain the same. There is no problem here. As far as I can see, the Senate only sees the board through its jaundiced eyes and it thinks there is a problem because it doesn't get what it wants.

It is a misconception to think that the Senate's problems are the students' problems or that the Senate is really the only representative body of all the students.

In theory, the Senate is representative of all, but not in practice. If a student has a complaint about SU policy, he should go to the board member in his school, or to a member-at-large.

If the Senate has a complaint, the Senate board member should be the one the senators see. It's the ASUO Senate that has problems, not the Student Union Board.

Mark Stephens
Sophomore, Business
Administration Chairman,
SU Personnel Committee

Questions for the Co-op

Emerald Editor:
Perhaps someone from the Accounting and Business Statistics department should take a careful look at the balance sheet of the Co-op, published in the November 15 Emerald.

Is it true that the profits of "the students' store" amounted to 8.7 per cent of sales? (I believe that supermarkets make a profit on sales of 2 per cent or less, and this is supposed to be a record year for them!)

Is it true that profits amounted to 19.8 per cent of investment, denoted "land, building and equipment"? (I thought anything over 10 per cent was supposed to be an extraordinarily good return.)

Is it true that profits not refunded last year represented 11 per cent of all such profits retained in the business previously, 1920 to 1965? (Just investing the present \$543,500 retained earnings total at 5 per cent would next year produce over \$27,000, which is over half the total of this past year's retained earnings.)

Present earnings "retained for expansion" are almost as great as the present total value of land, building and equipment.

There could be quite an expansion just on what they already have got.

Is it true that the 1966 earnings not refunded to Co-op members represented 39.4 per cent of the year's total earnings?

That is also 62.3 per cent of the amount that was actually refunded. This was about the same thing that happened last year, if memory serves. Would it not be possible to increase the refund rate this year from 10 per cent to 15 per cent?

James L. Hutter
Graduate, Political
Science

Not Ashamed

Emerald Editor:
Miss Fioretti was correct about one thing, and that is that we had no intention whatsoever to imply that we were ashamed of the color black—the opposite is true.

But why can't it ever be said if the player is a Negro that "such-and-such is a good football player" rather than saying "such-and-such is a good Negro football player." I'm sure the school could care less what color he is.

Why go to the trouble of setting him apart? I thought the object of the sign was to name the great football players, not to name the great football players and the great Negro football player.

Furthermore, the word moleholes was a misprint, the editor meant to type molehills... that's what painting the duck black is the same as making mountains out of.

Pat Martin
Senior, Psychology

Sanderlin Speaks Out Good Job Harry, Nana, and Nipsey



Is Harry Belafonte a pro at building audience rapport? Would you believe it if you heard all the sober, book-fatigued, and traditionally reserved Oregonians belting out "Matilda" with him in Mac Court, purging their souls of depression-Oregon-style?

Would you believe it if you saw him chastise a girl in the floor section for looking at him through binoculars? "You don't want to miss a thing," he said, pulling the front of his shirt collar together and looking back at her through his hand-mike.

Anyone who saw the performance Friday will have to join me in endorsing Belafonte and the two entertainers sharing his stage and sound system. He and Greek folk singer Nana Mouskouri and comedian Nipsey Russell presented the finest, most coherent evening of entertainment I have ever seen at this University.

Belafonte, I endorse you.

