

# OREGON DAILY EMERALD

ALL-AMERICAN 1946-47

The Oregon Daily Emerald, official publication of the University of Oregon, published daily during the college year except Sundays, Mondays, and final examination periods. Entered as second-class matter at the postoffice, Eugene, Ore. Member of the Associated Collegiate Press

BOB FRAZIER, Editor BOB CHAPMAN, Business Manager  
 BILL YATES, Managing Editor JUNE GOETZE, BOBOLEE BROPHY, Co-News Editors

## An Unpopular Suggestion

Ten days ago this page carried an editorial entitled "Smiles, Smiles, Smiles," in which we suggested (dead pan) that a "Go to Hell Week" would be most relaxing after the social whirl to which most students are subjected. We thought it was funny.

A few days later Columnist Larry Lau came through with a suggestion that we also elect a "Go to Hell Queen," and then went on to suggest a few of the activities that might be carried out in this week of weeks. We thought that was funny, too.

Campus comment has convinced us that maybe we had something there, that mayhap people are a little tired of having so much fun, of being good fellas all the time.

While we stand by our statement that the Go to Hell Week was just an attempt (successful) at humor, we are ready to submit that our basic idea was good.

In short, it is high time to do a little stock-taking to evaluate the side show and the main tent. Scholarship regulations are being enforced at this University. It is more difficult to graduate today than it was before the war. But despite this there is a trend toward more enforced fun, toward dragging the student out of the library and into the social whirl.

Every week there are half a dozen fine activities, programs, concerts, rallies, dances, or firesides to which the student who would be hep must go. When does the poor kid study?

This situation has been brought about by over-zealous chairmen who have labored so successfully to make their activities more desirable than the others. All of them have succeeded.

It is a matter of prestige that each living organization boast as many "activity people" as possible. All they need is a 2-point and a lot of ambition, and they are certain to be big wheels in some activity.

At the same time (and this isn't a joke) the living organizations insist they are looking after the scholarship of their members, particularly their pledges. The Greek organizations usually have it in their charters and national statements of purpose that they will work to foster better scholarship. How well they succeed is readily seen in the list of "house grades" published in the Emerald each term.

No, they don't do so well. Non-affiliated students always

beat 'em, and the student who lives in no organized group at all stands the best chance of getting the good grades.

Following is a statement that will doubtless prove very unpopular:

It would seem reasonable that the organized groups, especially the Greek-letter groups, pay some attention to LIMITING the number and type of activities allowed their members. They could do worse than allowing them a free choice, which would doubtless be better than the present mad scramble for activity points.

These groups hold the key to a reasonable pruning of the activity program. If they really wish to be of service to the University and to their membership, they will encourage their members to do good jobs on a restricted list of wisely-selected activities.

The campus is already plagued with too many "activity tramps" who try to spread themselves too thin.

## A Purposeful Change

Purposeful changes have been made in the features of religious week, 1947-48. A change from Religious Emphasis Week to Religious Evaluation Week has been recorded, and the Emerald notes the significance. To emphasize—"to articulate with special force or stress, or to bring out clearly and forcibly" according to Funk and Wagnalls Unabridged Aid to Aspiring Journalists, denotes a basis quite different from that of evaluation. Referring again to F & W's Invaluable Piece of Prose, we find to evaluate means "to fix the value of; estimate the force of; appraise"—in other words, to weigh, to think, to investigate, and to re-weigh. The emphasis of last year's Religious Emphasis Week implied a foregone conclusion; the evaluation of this year's invites queries, probings, and even skepticism.

The leaders invited for the week are well grounded in the fundamentals of religion, as well as possessors of forthright and sincere spiritual beliefs. Their backgrounds are amazingly cosmopolitan, their faiths diverse. Quakers, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Jews, and Catholics are coming to the campus to teach, inspire and encourage evaluation. Their goal is not to proselyte but to educate, and the men are on the college level.

It's discouraging to be coerced—the campus should realize this well, for political, social, and economic coercion is forever with the University of Oregon. As we see it, coercion is disgruntling, but instruction is noble. The instruction, not coercion, which these men will present in the week of Religious Evaluation, will appeal to a sensible student body. The discussions will be appealing and informative for the student in search of truth—the ostensive goal of any University registrant. The leaders are of a college caliber, for masters degrees, Ph. D.'s, Phi Beta Kappas, and graduate studies are freely interspersed in their qualifications. They are not only spiritually convinced, but they have the facts that convinced them.

It might just be, during the next week, that "those who come to scoff remain to pray."

J. B. S.

## The Second Cup

By BETTY ANN STEVENS

Why in the name of all that is Holy Joe College, do fraternity sweetheating ditties roar the praises of wistful blondes with limpid eyes-of-blue? Anthropologically speaking, there IS a large proportion of Scandinavian stock in the great Northwest, but most coeds are Jeanies-with-light-brown hair. The ballads, besides being contrary to our democracy way of life, are rather annoying to Miss Melting Pot of 1947.

The Betas neatly sidestep the issue by passing the loving cup around, but K-Sig and Sigma songsters persist in extolling the charms of maidenly addicts to ye olde peroxide bottle.

In a recent quiz, Dr. Lester Beck asked, "Is blonde or brunette hair a secondary sex characteristic?"

"Blonde," is the answer, said I.

\* \* \*

Another thing, is it fair that fellows like Bob Frazier, Ed Allen, Stu Norene, Joe Gurley, Ward Christensen, Tom Wright, Bob Proding, Jim Thayer, Harry Glickman, Johnny Kahananui, Erling Erlandson, Marvin Tims, Win Kelker and Smitty, the Co-op janitor, be overlooked in the search for a truly representative Joe College? They all can remember when the tall firs around here were little saplings.

\* \* \*

More of Joes, queens, and contests... The shorties in the Sigma Chi tong have organized a midget club, selecting as "Girl We Would Most Like to Shrink" the Deegee's pleasant-personality girl, Barbara Borrevik.

\* \* \*

And then, we have a candidate for "Most Wide-Eyed Freshman of the Week," a pledge at the ADPI house who asked Social Chairman Gerry Healy when they were going to have an exchange with the TNEs.

## One World Club Raises Some Points About Super Government Blueprints

By THE ONE WORLD CLUB

(The following article includes excerpts of Dr. C. P. Schleicher's speech "World Government—Its Practical Difficulties" given before the One World club.)

An intellectual revolution against the present system of multi-state governments and power politics is brewing. Today many people who feel world government is desirable or necessary, if asked a few years ago would have taken the negative.

More people than those engaged in the social sciences now feel that a central government is a necessity. The physicists, for example, came out of their shells after the atom bomb had been dropped and declared their support of such a system. Prominent citizens including Einstein, and even Truman, have expressed their desire for world government.

But how can this come about? The world must first agree on the fundamentals. At present the world's super-states, United States and Russia, are at the greatest odds. Most of this trouble is based on nothing more than fear. We are deathly afraid of each other—how can we meet this problem?

### Basic Differences

Supposing this will eventually be worked out to the satisfaction of world government advocates, then what of the basic differences in all countries—governmental, social, cultural, and economic? How can individuals compete under such a set-up?

The details can be bickered over, but can the fundamentals of nations be fused or given up peaceably?

Many distrust government, i.e., in their own countries and localities, yet want more under a universal scheme. Is it possible that this world government would grow so strong that the world would

be caught in the grasp of a Frankenstein it had created?

### Good Questions

Of what would this central power consist? A general assembly composed of peoples of the world? Of an amended UN charter? If the assembly, how would delegates be chosen? If not based on individual governments, how? How would the votes be distributed? Who could enforce the law? Logically, all this would go back to the sovereign nations, but would not that defeat the underlying purpose?

Amending the charter requires the vote of all five permanent UN members and a two-thirds vote of the rest. Again, nations are resorted to, and these nations could block the plan easily.

Assuming this world parliament could materialize, it follows that political parties would develop. Since it is a government of the world, these parties would need to cut across old national boundaries. Would it be possible? Would Russia allow capitalistic propaganda within her territory? What of the United States and communistic ideas?

If this barrier were also overcome, then what of the government's scope? Could it, for instance, abolish existing immigration laws? If so, would not this wreck the standard of living for many sections? Could racial and religious relations be regulated? Would we have a bill of rights?

And what of the old internal governments? Could each former nation have what it wanted? How far could the central agency interfere in internal administration? What type of government would be allowable? What of national disarmament? Would the central power have the only army and the states have militia, if anything?

The present national sovereignty plan is probably not good, but would world government be any better?

## Reader Cites Disc Statistics Takes Issue with Columnist

To the Editor:

To the few who clearly understood (and I was not among them) Ted Hallock's pedantic column in Wednesday's Emerald defending the recent Petrillo ban on records, it must be evident that Hallock defeated his argument on three counts.

(1) Hallock—the radio program director—could not afford to replace records and transcriptions with live entertainment over his KUGN, or any other station in a city of less than 100,000. In the first place, local stations could not afford to pay union wages, and in the second and more important place, the radio audience would not listen to the live music because local talent, on the average, never rises above the worst in recorded music level.

(2) Hallock—the musician—must realize that without recordings, no musician could get to be famous and make a wage above that of a laborer. Bands, such as the Kenton crew, could not progress past the Balboa stage without recordings. Hallock will probably agree that without records the Kenton orchestra would be nowhere—and Kenton would be the first to admit it.

(3) Hallock—the record collector—should realize that the public is not particularly interested in the music of union musicians at this time. For instance, out of the three records reaching the million mark in sales during 1947, only one—Francis Craig's "Near You"—was in need of union musicians. Ted Weem's "Heartaches" was a ten-year-old repressing and the Harmonicat's "Peg O' My Heart" was not considered union-made because the AFM does not recognize the harmonica as a musical instrument.

The public, in their record purchasing today, is concerned first with the title of the song, and second, with the vocalist. Even if the record companies did not have a backlog of unreleased masters which should last a year, they could make records of popular tunes using a vocal group to back up the soloist. During the first Petrillo ban a few years back, this was tried and it certainly did not hamper the selling of records such as Sinatra's "You'll Never Know," Hayme's "Wait For Me Mary," and Crosby's "Oh What a Beautiful Morning."

Another cat in the bag of the platter pressers is reissuing of masters

(Please turn to page three)