

# Oregon Daily EMERALD

The OREGON DAILY EMERALD is published Feb 4 thru 8, 11 thru 15, 18 thru 22, 25 thru 29, March 10, Apr 2 thru 4, 7 thru 11, 14 thru 18, 21 thru 25, 28 thru May 2, May 6 thru 10, 12 thru 16, 19 thru 22, and May 26 by the Associated Students of the University of Oregon. Entered as second class matter at the post office, Eugene, Oregon. Subscription rates: \$5 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. Initialed editorials are written by the associate editors. Unsigned editorials are written by the editor.

## A Split Five For Spring Vacation

We're going to use a nasty word in the editorial column today.

### Midterms.

To paraphrase Tom Paine, these are the times that try men's brains. These are the times when there's only one side to everything, and that side bad. These are the times when the sleeping porch at night fairly hums with mumbled snatches of Chaucer, Spanish, mathematical formulae, and the Twenty-One demands.

A fragile sunbeam pierced through our aura of blackest gloom the other day. We just remembered something.

For the first time since 1949, we're going to have a full week of spring vacation this year.

At last! A chance to recuperate from finals long enough for the anti-sleep pills to wear off; to go home and get that accumulated cleaning done at Pop's expense; to find out what we got in that course last term before the deadline to drop classes rolls around.

We're glad the higher-ups finally decided we wouldn't be ruining our academic standards by giving more than two days of spring vacation. We suspect—privately of course—that the truth is they're tired of our dull faces too. Three cheers for the higher-ups!

Now if we can just live through these midterms... and final week... —G. G.

## Is The P.T. and T. Really Confident?

Three men paid a special visit to a University student Tuesday.

They were three Pacific Telephone and Telegraph officials—Fred Scholl, commercial manager; W. G. Keith, commercial engineer; and R. B. Bacon, southern Oregon district manager.

The student was Dick Kading, UO phone committee chairman.

The purpose? We're not sure.

Their main reason seemed to be to request an acceptance of the pay phone status quo, giving them more time to investigate. (Time, incidentally, during which you're dropping those dimes into the coin boxes.)

The phone men want to take a survey—to be completed probably by next fall term—of tariff administration throughout the country. They'll be ready again to discuss the pay phone matter after this is completed.

Mr. Scholl doesn't want to bother with a hearing because hearings are lengthy and involved.

But, if the students should request one, he's confident PT&T would win.

If the phone company is so confident, why doesn't it want a hearing right now? Officials could save the time and work involved in the proposed survey. Why did they bother to send three top men to talk personally with Kading?

Let's ask for a hearing now and find out to what degree Mr. Scholl's confidence is justified.

## Elementary Logic



"But Professor Snarf, how can you say whether or not I should flunk this course when it just so happens I've never been here when you gave exams?"

## -- Letters to the Editor --

### Surnames Preferred

Emerald Editor:

When I entered my first university the orientation speaker said, "You will be addressed by your surnames in this school. In grade school and in high school you were called by your nicknames or first names, but now you are mature men and women. A part of higher education is learning to address other adults by their surnames and getting used to being addressed by yours. Accordingly you will be addressed here as you will be in the business and professional world."

I suggest that the University of Oregon adopt a regulation to the effect that professors and students should address each other by surnames and that at freshman orientations the students will be told what to expect.

Violations due to occasional carelessness need not be punished, but the use of surnames should be looked upon as appropriate form.

Jerome E. Frederick

### On Phone Profits

Emerald Editor:

Your editorial report of the earnings of American Telephone and Telegraph Company is, per se, wholly insignificant and meaningless.

If you must bring the earnings of this company and all of its subsidiaries into a petty controversy with the local company, then there are other considerations. Let's not distort the picture through omission of other relevant and pertinent data which must be considered if we are to investigate the earnings of this or any other company.

The 1950 net income of the parent company (\$286,802,293) is a return on an investment of \$10,105,187,781 in plant and property, and represents 2.838 per cent of this investment. These figures include all controlled subsidiaries. The income of Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Co. (included above) was \$46,079,799, or a return of 3.44 per cent on an investment of \$1,341,438,776. The 1950 income of the "Bell System" companies, excluded from the earnings of American, amounted to \$11,099,510, representing a return of 4.056 per cent on an investment in plant of \$273,646,660. Data for 1951 are not yet available in Moody's reports which may be found in the library.

Who is to say that the earnings of these monopolies are unreasonable and unjust? All rates charged by public utilities are subject to regulation and review by the ICC and state regulatory agencies. Perhaps your objection to the tremendous earnings of these "monsters" should be voiced to proper authority. Or maybe you should write your Congressman.

If it is a function of the Emerald to incite an unfavorable attitude toward the Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Co. through speculation on the earnings of the telephone companies, it is also a necessary function to present all pertinent data concerning their profits.

Monroe Blackwell

### Great Books Major?

Emerald Editor:

The acceptance by the University administration of an honors program starting at the freshman level (and continuing possibly through the senior year) proves the existence on the Oregon campus of a healthy and critical attitude toward curriculum problems. At the expense of the repetitious Emerald-Law School editorial feud I would like to invite student and faculty comment in the letters column to a small idea which might fit in with this curricula development.

The idea is essentially this: why not set up a separate interdepartmental major—open to qualified and interested students—based upon the Great Books?

I know that this is certainly not an original idea; it is being discussed all over the country, and has been adopted in several universities, notably Chicago,

Speaking personally, however, it seems that the course might have some merit. It might be worked like this:

Starting at the freshman year, students who qualify in the upper deciles of their entrance exams (or qualify by other criteria) would be enrolled in the equivalent of a Great Books major, leading to the Bachelor of Arts degree. Students in the major would be expected to become proficient in two major literary languages besides their native tongue. By literary languages I include English, French, German, Spanish, Greek, Latin, Italian, Norwegian, Chinese, and Japanese, all of which are currently being taught at the University.

Every student in this major would also be required to take brief factual courses in literary forms, and, possibly, literary philosophy.

During each of the four undergraduate years, the Great Books major would study the grammar and literature of each of his selected languages.

In addition, he would read, critically and constructively, the translated great books of other languages.

For an example, an American student might select as his two languages French and German. For each of his four years he would read the best from the vast fields of English, French, and German classics—the King James edition of the Bible, Paradise Lost, Chaucer, Shakespeare, the major English poets, Les Miserables, Voltaire, Montesquieu, Rousseau, Zola, Faust, Lessing, Schiller, Mann, and so on—each in its native tongue.

From the great books of the languages he would also select the best, in the best translation available, whether English, French, or German. From the galaxy of significant literature he would master Plato, Sophocles, Homer, Thucydides, Aristotle, Demosthenes, Caesar, Plutarch, Cervantes, Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, and on to the limits of the student's capabilities.

It seems to me that a major study developed along these lines has several advantages:

(1) It would give the student a broad and varying comprehensive grasp of the great

thoughts, the great situation and people of the world's cultural history. Unless we reawaken appreciation and understanding of these ideas, our age is apt to leave only Mickey Spillane's pornography as our mental heritage.

(2) While much small detail of political science, history, literature, and other traditional departments of instruction will be missed in such a course, I know from my own experience how many "facts" from my own undergraduate major, not to mention other courses I have taken have since departed my memory. The fault of much of this, I believe, lies with our reliance on the survey textbook. Put great characters, excellent speech, dramatic historical development, and vitally-important philosophy together in one work such as War and Peace, and there you have far better picture of the Russian people, history, and traditions of government, to be remembered far longer, than any text on Russian history and culture could offer.

(3) Finally, a cultured university graduate, fluent in three languages, intensely aware of what IS and what is IMPORTANT in the world, intimately knowing the culture of three peoples, and having a broad grasp of the cultural heritage of much of the rest of the world, would stand at least on equal terms with any "traditional" undergraduate in competition for the better jobs.

My own limited (too much unfortunately) acquaintance with the world's Great Books has shown me that much real information, that most of the important ideas that are valued today are to be found therein. Therefore I propose that we maintain the traditional departmental division of the liberal arts field for the specialized scholar, but that we also create a separate interdepartmental program of this nature. We already have a tendency to "area" study (for example in the Far East) and I propose that we broaden this even further to a "world man" study through the Great Books.

Michael Callahan

## A Day at the Zoo

## Helpful Hints For Politicos Dept.: Fence-jumping Form Letters

By Bob Funk

We have ceased long since to be amazed at the interesting back-flips which are periodically executed by those involved in the field of campus politics.

Charges have been made that the persons most active in campus politics are those interested in promoting their house; those interested in having verbal arguments with members of the opposition; and those who just generally like to mess things up. When we were younger, we occasionally involved ourselves in the political maelstrom. It had something to do with juvenile emotional outcroppings which we have at least partially overcome.

However, this rather dim view of campus politicians is probably extremely unjust. There are undoubtedly just lots of people around who are sincere in their political views. We can even name one—Virginia Wright. There must be others—maybe on some other campus.

Whether this or that house is making hay in one or the other or both of the political camps is immaterial. It is how they write the idealistic letter glossing over the whole stinking mess that

counts. For convenience of fence jumpers (and all of us have jumped fences so many times that the grass in both pastures getting considerably trampled) we present the following form letters:

"We, the members of (name some lily-white club for the perpetuation of obscure rituals) hereby notify the United Students Association that we no longer consider it to be the idealistic instrument of democratic government that it once was. Therefore, we can no longer betray our principles and our brethren on the other side by lingering under your soiled banner."

For alternate use:

"We, the members of (same name), having examined our consciences, find that we can no longer reconcile ourselves with the principles of the Associated Greek Students. Therefore, we intend to break our affiliation with that organization (and incidentally get a few people the USA ticket)."

An additional comment which is necessary is the following:

"When asked for comment on his house's action, X. Mugwump stated that 'we think we're doing the best thing for the house and for the campus.' Mugwump declined further comment."

Some people's political bread buttered on both sides, which probably tastes excellent, makes handling rather messy.



BOB FUNK