

Oregon Daily EMERALD

The OREGON DAILY EMERALD is published Monday through Friday during the college year, except examination and holiday periods, with issues on Homecoming Saturday and Junior Weekend Saturday by the Associated Students of the University of Oregon. Entered as second class matter at the post office, Eugene, Oregon. Subscription rates: \$7 per school year, \$2 per term.

Opinions expressed on the editorial page are those of the writer and do not pretend to represent the opinions of the ASUO or of the University. Initial editorials are written by the associate editors. Unsigned editorials are written by the editor.

LOENA LARSON, Editor
PHIL BETTENS, Managing Editor
GRETCHEN GRONDAREL, BILL CLOTHIER, DON DEWEY, Associate Editors
GRETCHEN GREFE, Advertising Manager

An Editorial

A Gripe: The Pay Phone Era Comes to Oregon

"Hello... Is Susie there?"
"I'm sorry, she's not in right now."
"Darn... another nickel wasted!"
That's a pretty common exchange of conversation on campus today.

Why? Maybe a lot of alums didn't know it, but the pay telephone era is here. All living organizations now have pay phones. They were installed just before school started this fall.

The reason? The Pacific Telephone and Telegraph company has a tariff—okayed by the Public Utilities commission—which, they say, calls for the phones in "semi-public" organizations. (That's what they now call our campus homes.)

The same tariff has been in existence for over 20 years, but the company just began working under the new interpretation in 1947.

Expensive? It sure is. The old flat rate phones were \$7.50 per month. Say, for instance, that 20 students in an organization place one call per day. That's \$1 a day for 30 days, or \$30 per month.

Are students complaining? Yes. Riled-up OSC students succeeded in stalling off the phone installers. We've met with them. We're also working with Willamette. The Oregon Federation of Collegiate Leaders passed a resolution demanding abandonment of the pay phone policy.

Progress? Some. A recent letter from George Flagg, PUC commissioner, asked us up for a meeting to discuss the problem.

Future plans? To meet with Flagg. If necessary, to have a PUC hearing. To make absolutely sure the phone company is justified in forcing the "nickle-eaters" upon us.

We thought you alums would like to know.

Spirit--A Way of Life

Welcome home, alums!

Many of you won't recognize the place since your last time here. We're being very progressive at present.

Notice our new science building? And that cavity down between Oregon and Commerce—that'll turn out to be a new home for the business administration school.

Take a stroll around campus and see our new lawns and the other signs of improvement. There are lots of new innovations besides the Student Union and Carson Hall.

Even our football coach is new—and he'll be fielding a team this afternoon that is probably the newest thing in collegiate football. It's just beginning to get broken in.

There's just one thing that is as old as Skinner's Butte.

That's the Oregon spirit you bring back to the campus every year. And the spirit the campus shows in its many ways for the Homecoming group. It's more than a tradition. It's a way of life at Oregon.

This day is yours to share with us. This is when you return to become a part of what you once were.

Great feeling, huh!

And incidentally, don't waste any sympathy over that baby football team of ours. This could be the day it becomes a man. The old pros up north may be favored on the books but this is the occasion when previous form means nothing.—B. C.

Throw Out the 'Win or Else'

The football season is almost over—on this campus at least. Now seems to be a good time for evaluation of King Football and its place in campus life.

This has been an unhappy year for the sport; it's been an unpleasant year for most sports, amateur and professional. Several institutions dropped football entirely, a Colorado Industrial commission ruling branded a Denver university player as an employee of the school, and the biggest shock of all was the West Point cribbing scandal.

College presidents across the country are now trying to cope with the problem of putting football in its proper niche. Many are the suggestions... Limit the season to September, October and November. Forbid Bowl games. Do away with televised games. Scrap the two-platoon system, etc., etc.

The best idea we've yet heard comes from a college coach.

George Allen, football mentor at Whittier college in California, complains that the fans are ruining football and that we must have a "general disarmament of the will to win."

Allen suggests that our college presidents conduct a strenuous campaign toward winning the alumni and fans over to the idea of relaxing the "win or else" pressure. Our Dr. Newburn has tried to do this very thing the past few months.

The wolves have been silent this year. This was a building year and what victories we had were just so much gravy. Next year will be different. The fans will demand victories and more victories.

Why can't they look at football in its proper perspective. They should be reminded that the University of Oregon is an educational institution, not the Los Angeles Rams or Chicago Bears.—D. D.

A Dinner and Better Relations

Well, the journalism school's annual family dinner was held as scheduled Tuesday evening. The main portion of the program was devoted to skits—the faculty ribbed the students, the students ribbed the faculty and the Emerald, and the two journalism honoraries—Theta Sigma Phi and Sigma Delta Chi—poked fun at everyone and anyone.

It's a good idea, this family dinner. We enjoy getting together with our instructors, meeting them on such an informal basis. The skits are presented all in fun, and nobody—we hope—gets their feelings hurt.

Perhaps because of this, you'll find a good spirit existing between journalism students and faculty—a feeling of friendliness that exists, not only at this annual dinner, but all through the year. You find that, if you get a chance to know the "talking machine" outside of his classroom, he turns out to be a pretty nice guy.

Other schools and departments... please copy.—P. B.

Letters to the Editor

Freedom and Beer

I have lived in the United States a little over two years now, and the best explanation of "what the lady in the harbor of New York stands for" I have heard is the following: "Liberty or freedom means that you can do what you want, as long as you don't hurt others."

I think that anybody will agree to this explanation. To be sure it does not cover all American freedoms, because by expressing, or writing, your opinion you may very well hurt someone else; nevertheless you are free to do so. In other words, the above definition gives us only the minimum meaning of freedom. Needless to say, if the freedom of the press is an inalienable right, this freedom "to do as you please if you don't hurt others" is one too.

So far so good; but now I am in a dilemma, because I cannot see how it does anybody harm if a 21-year-old student wants to drink a glass of beer in Taylor's after classes. Furthermore I do not think that it does anybody harm if a man wants to go out at night to play shuffleboard and drink a glass of beer in the same place. But then this man and student must be free to do so.

The liquor commission, though, has forbidden the above things, so they cannot be inalienable rights (actually the liquor commission has chosen an indirect way: it won't extend the license.

This is a grave matter; let us make sure about the arguments. The meaning of freedom is certainly correct—if you do not hurt anyone, who cares what you do?

What about a glass of beer? The arguments against it are:
1. "Beer drinking is immoral, if the majority wants to restrict or forbid it, it can do so in a democratic system."

This has very far-reaching consequences: What if the majority of the people in the U. S. thought it was immoral to have a black skin? If a person thinks it immoral to drink beer, he by no means should; he can argue, but not force his opinion in this matter. Morality is not dependent on a majority vote, what did we fight the last war for?

2. "This is the only way to prevent the abuse of beer-drinking."

This is a stronger argument, but not sufficient. I will not deny that beerdrinking is frequently abused, that the abuse may be the cause of hurting others, and that the abuse of liquor calls for laws to stop it. But the penalties on tipsy driving in this state are ridiculously easy; it seems that so many people want to drink some beer while driving that anyone who wants stricter laws is voted out of office. But if the people do not want to employ the lawful means they have against the abuse of liquor, why do the lawmakers bother about trying out unlawful means?

It seems to me that the liquor commission has overstepped its legal power (knowingly, because of the indirect way employed), and that the students and the people in Oregon should do something about it.

Dirk Schepers

So THIS Is Oregon

How Can an Honor Code Work? College Society Accepts Cheating

By Jim Haycox

I don't think I've talked to anybody yet who thinks an honor code will work at Oregon. On this point, at least, lots of people agree.

And the people who feel it won't work put up some very convincing arguments. For one thing, they say one can't compare Oregon to other schools where it is applied... like the Naval Academy, West Point, Reed or Stanford. These, they say, are selective institutions which take only the better students. Oregon takes anybody with an Oregon high school diploma.

Besides that, who's to say it does work where they have it. West Point proved it a farce.

They also argue that people just don't like to rat on other people. Imagine yourself seeing someone cheating. Would you turn him in, knowing he might get kicked out of school for it? Do you think you have the right to do it?

We just seem to accept the fact that cheating is one way to get by... though a dangerous one if caught. We don't think it could be eradicated or feel we individually have the right to accuse each other of it. It is acceptable in our college society.

To be sure, the same people who say it wouldn't work will turn right around and say... "But it sure would be a good idea if it did work."

I wonder if they actually know what they're talking about? It is a curious dualism.

Way back in the first grade, the teacher told us we shouldn't cheat. How many times we've been told since then is hard to say. The only thing I do remember is that by the time I'd gotten here it was taken for granted that I knew I shouldn't.

Why shouldn't I? Can you sit right down and give 10 reasons why you shouldn't? Try it. I shouldn't cheat because... it isn't fair. Isn't it fair to give yourself the best break you know how? It might hurt someone else, but certainly not very much.

I shouldn't cheat because... it isn't honorable? Well if everybody else does, that means they're no better than I am... no more or less honorable... doesn't it?

I shouldn't cheat because... it discourages any attempt to learn. Learn? You forget most of what you learn in college anyway. What difference does it make?

These are stupid arguments, to be sure, but you hear them. Or you hear arguments that sound just like them. I said nobody really likes to consider themselves dishonest. Apparently they don't consider cheating really dishonest, or dishonorable.

Cheating is morally wrong. But try telling somebody someday that they are "morally wrong."

They told us not to cheat all right, but I suspect they never told us why not. Consequently we have an honor and an honesty, but honor and honesty are just about what ever we want to make them.

WELCOME ALUMS

FROM

HOGAN and WAYNE

Who specialize in . . .

WISE BUYS

FOR SMART Shoppers

HOGAN'S & WAYNE'S

GROCERY

MEAT MARKET

Phone 4-6209

544 13th St.