

'Tiger of the Senate' missed for a decade

When Wayne Morse died ten years ago next Sunday, an era abruptly ended for Oregon and national politics.

"Abruptly" may sound odd. Morse was 73-years-old. But he was still fighting. At the time of his death, the "Tiger of the Senate" was waging a pitched battle for his old Senate seat against the upstart who had set the political world on its collective ear by nudging Morse out of the box six years earlier.

Bob Packwood still represents Oregon in the Senate, and well, some say, but without the fire and elan that Wayne Morse brought to the national political scene. That's a mighty tall order, certainly one that won't be filled for a while.

It seems almost obscene to use the word politics when talking about Wayne Morse. He was a statesman, one of a rare breed at any time in American history and certainly a rarity today.

"Wayne Morse never made a deal with anyone in 24 years in the Senate!" That was the Tiger's own boast, and one to which he was well entitled. The wheeling and dealing that is so much a part of congressional life was far from his liking. Morse was a truly independent person, immune to corruption or labeling.

And he belonged to the entire nation, not just Oregon. It's especially appropriate to remember his national legacy this summer because of another key anniversary coming up. In August 1964, Congress gave near-unanimous approval to a Lyndon Johnson-spawned resolution that would mark the beginning of another era in the Vietnam quagmire. Two lone dissenting votes were cast.

Sen. Ernest Greuning of Alaska preceded Sen. Morse of Oregon in death by one month. Neither lived to see the tragic end of a 30-plus year conflict that, they both asserted, the U.S. had no business entering.

Morse's remonstrance against the Tonkin Gulf resolution is one of the most chillingly, accurately prophetic statements ever uttered. "We're going to be bogged down in Southeast Asia, and we're going to kill thousands of American boys until finally . . . the American people are going to say what the French people finally said: they've had enough."

Morse was ousted from his Senate seat of 24 years by Packwood, even as his earlier prophecies of doom were bearing fruit. But even after his defeat, Morse opted for continued national activism against the war over what would have been a well-deserved rest at his Crest Drive ranch in Eugene.

He was an attorney and teacher of attorneys. He spent 15 years on the University law school faculty, 13 as dean. Morse's guidance helped build the modern school of law that is the pride of today's University.

He was a respected labor arbiter. In 1941, he helped settle a national railroad dispute, literally on the eve of Pearl Harbor. Once again: Morse in the right place at the right time.

Yet, he believed in the workers' right to strike against an employer, calling it essential to a free society. Wayne Morse, for all his national acclaim, was a true Oregon populist.

This populism, coupled with the seemingly opposite role of national statesman, helped create the legacy that Wayne Morse left ten years ago. Then-Gov. Tom McCall (who better to say it?) observed, in his eulogy to Morse, that while the senator's politics weren't always popular, the man Morse was. "We could always depend on him to say what he thought—the first lesson of integrity."

The day after Morse died, the Emerald opined: "Were Wayne Morse alive today, he'd be fighting to improve the problems of this country, not sitting in a corner stewing about them. . . . We should follow his lead."

We can pay no better tribute to Wayne Morse than to reiterate our admonition of a decade ago. We need it more today.



Photo by Michael Clapp

letters

What's fair?

On June 12, the Supreme Court handed down a ruling involving employee rights in the context of "conflicts" between the principles of job seniority and affirmative action. In its 6-3 decision, the Court favored the seniority principle over affirmative action policies.

As Bean McFadden, University affirmative action coordinator, indicated in an Emerald article on June 21, this curiously unimaginative interpretation once again leaves American non-white minorities and women in a "no win" situation.

Affirmative action supports the fairness of selecting — during a reasonable period — qualified job applicants from "under-represented groups" (which have been systematically discriminated against) over white males, who historically have been "favored" arbitrarily in the competition of non-menial, salaried work. This is a fully defensible, temporary, ameliorative policy for redressing a serious wrong perpetrated against American minorities and women.

Accordingly, the recent Supreme Court ruling which flies in the face of this socially just, compensatory mechanism seems grossly unfair.

Interestingly, two perceptive American women, one black and the other white — Eleanor Holmes Norton (former chair of the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission) and Pat Schroeder (U.S. Con-

gresswoman from Colorado) — have suggested the appropriateness of a "shared work-reduction plan" when job layoffs seem imminent. How is it that the elementary fairness of this "sharing the pain" solution was somehow overlooked by the Burger Court majority?

I realize that affirmative action remains a decidedly controversial "patch" in the social fabric of contemporary American life. Nevertheless, surely it deserves at least a modicum of judicial protection from the nation's highest tribunal.

Ron Rousseve
Professor of Counseling Psychology

Agencies help

In your article on U.S.-Soviet exchange programs (Thursday) some inaccuracies slipped through in quotes attributed to me. I did not mean to suggest that exchange programs function chiefly "without government aid or intercession," for, in fact, the major programs are negotiated (but not always supervised) by the Department of State and other government agencies.

My main point was that the exchanges ordinarily do not excite the interest of the Chief Executive, whose role in such matters is not significant, except for occasional dramatic acts of genuine diplomacy.

The U.S.-U.S.S.R. scholarly exchange in most respects has gone on smoothly since its inception in 1959, despite wars, the Cuban crises, and even the lapse of formal exchange agreements (as in 1981). Even without the treaty renewal, both academic communities honored each other as if agreements existed. It is also true that some American universities have direct institutional ties with East European universities — such as the University's participation in the international graduate center at Dubrovnik in Yugoslavia (a spectacular city on the Adriatic).

One might draw the parallel of private initiatives to match

the city of Springfield with Soviet Komsomolsk, for the sake of cultural exchange between school children. Incidentally, the objection has recently been raised that Komsomolsk was a bad choice because it was built mainly with Gulag slave laborers. Considering the history of America, though, that seems more a point of rapport than a point of insurmountable difference.

James L. Rice
Associate Professor of Russian

Registering flap

In reference to the July 5 article in the Emerald regarding a proposal to give student-athletes an early registration time, consideration about the other students' attitudes should be taken. There is, indeed, a particular attitude that the student-athletes are a privileged class. Giving student-athletes an advantage during registration time over non-student-athletes appears unjust.

A requirement for student-athletes to enroll in an average of 12 hours per term (full time) does not seem to be sufficient grounds for considering such a proposal. If it does, then other students who are also required to enroll full time, such as recipients of student loans, Pell grants, and various scholarships, should be granted the same opportunity. With this just consideration, the whole point seems quite circular, since the majority of students would be eligible and nothing would be gained.

I would like to make clear that I am not making any implications that the athletes are not appreciated. Their efforts and achievements give the University tremendous pride. The point being made is that they should be at this university to get an education, and in that respect, they are students, just as all other individuals enrolled in this institution. The price of an education is too high to exclude considerations of the student population as a whole.

L.J. Fairclough
Business

oregon daily
emerald

The summer edition of the Oregon Daily Emerald is published Tuesdays and Thursdays, except during exam week and vacations, by the Oregon Daily Emerald Publishing Co. at the University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon, 97403.

The Emerald operates independently of the University with offices on the third floor of the Erb Memorial Union and is a member of the Associated Press.

News and Editorial 686-5511
Display Advertising and Business 686-3712
Classified Advertising 686-4343
Production 686-4381
Circulation 686-5511

Editor Michele Matassa
Managing Editor/Editorial Page Editor Jim Moore
News Editor Michael Kulaga
Photo Editor Michael Clapp

Associate Editors
Higher Education Mike Sims
Administration Mike Duncan
Politics/Community Paul Ertelt
ASUO/Student Activities Julie Shippen
Night Editor Jim Moore

Reporters: Diana Elliott, Sean Axmaker.

General Staff
Advertising Manager Susan Thelen
Production Manager Russell Steele
Classified Advertising Carrie Greaves
Controller Jean Ownbey

Ad Sales: Rachel Bellamy, Richard Skeen, Julie Buirice.
Production: Sharla Cassidy, Kelly Cornyn, Kathy Gallagher, Carrie Greaves, Kelly Neff, Michele Ross, Colleen Tremaine, Hank Trotter.