

Oregon Daily EMERALD

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published five days a week during the school year, except during examinations and vacation periods, by the Student Publications Board 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 Emerald and do not pretend to represent the opinion of the ASUO or the University. Unsigned editorials are written by the editor; initialed editorials by members of the editorial board.

BILL MAINWARING, Editor
MARCIA MAUNEY, Editorial Page Editor
SALLY JO GREIG, SAM VAHEY, Associate Editors
JACK WILSON, Sports Editor
DOROTHY BARKER, Ass't Adv. Mgr.
EDITORIAL BOARD: Bill Mainwaring, Marcia Mauney, Sally Jo Greig, Sam Vahey, Chuck Mitchelmore, Cornelia Fogle, Jack Wilson, Al Johnson.
Photo Editor: Brant Ducey
Nat'l Adv. Mgr.: Jo Anne Milligan
Classified Adv. Mgr.: Arlene Krauss
Women's Editor: Dorothy West
LORETTA MEYER, Business Manager
KEN NIEHANS, Adv. Mgr.
CORNELIA FOGLE, News Editor
CHARMION FORD, Office Manager
Circulation Mgr.: Sam Vahey
Asst. Sports Editors: Jerry Ramsey, Jim Larimore
Executive Secretary: Geri Gobel

Be Proud of Your Liberal Education

"So you go to college. And what will you be when you graduate?" Sounds familiar, doesn't it. That is the American public questioning us.

It is a difficult question to answer. Especially if we are in Liberal Arts or one of its departments. The American public expects us to be a something; or else, "Why are you going to college?"

It almost takes a fearless person to say, "I am going to college to be educated." It is much easier to hem and haw about possibly going into research, or maybe giving lectures and writing articles.

But why hedge? A university's primary purpose is to educate. Training for a profession is secondary. "But you must be practical," retorts the public.

We must agree with the public about

Pity the Poor Freshman

Pity the poor freshman, he said, and so they did. Orient him, he said, and so they did. Rush him, he said, and so they did. Now, adjust him, he said, and so they did. And they gave him Gracious Living and Rooters' Lids and Midterms. And blind dates for the Sophomore Whiskerino. And now, they said, you're on your own. And the organizers of organized pity retired to watch the growth of the fruits of their labors.

Now what, he asked, is wrong with blind dates for the Sophomore Whiskerino?

"being practical." Of course we are fond of eating and having a place to rest. However, practicality needn't include only the securing of material comforts. Isn't it just as practical to be able to think, question, and resolve?

Even though a person is expertly trained for a profession, he doesn't necessarily succeed. He forgets, or maybe doesn't realize, that he must put his skills to work in a complex world — a place where skills cannot stand alone.

There is time to decide on a profession after an education. We must not let the public hurry us into rejecting a liberal education. We should truly be proud to say, "I will be educated when I graduate." (S.J.G.)

Nothing, they responded, it's humanitarian. And it's money, answered the sophomore class, anticipating the ticket sales.

But suppose, he said, that mistakes are made and the 5-foot 8 girl is lined up with the 4-foot 11 boy? Aha, they said, but that's where the previous benefits come in—training in Gracious Living will take care of that. The freshman need not worry at all; we have taken pity upon him.

Pity, he said, the poor freshman.

(C.H.M.)

Sad Dad



"I'm trying to work his way through college, Madam, and . . ."

From the Squirrel Cage

ASUO Cabinet Gaining Responsibility, Usefulness

By **DARREL BRITTSAN**
 ASUO President

As you read the article of the Emerald concerning the ASUO cabinet meeting, you may have wondered exactly what the cabinet is and just where it fits into the scheme of things. This group receives little publicity, yet it often does much work in behalf of student government.



It is composed of the ASUO president, vice-president, chairman of the Student Union board, chairman of the Co-op board,

Emerald editor, AWS president, public relations chairman, social chairman, athletic chairman, and director of student affairs.

They are to advise and assist the president of the ASUO in administering the affairs of the student body association. The cabinet is also supposed to submit proposals to the Senate designed to promote the objectives of our student government. In addition they have the right to attend and speak in Senate meetings.

These functions are quite flexible and the cabinet can become a highly significant organization or one that exists merely on paper. The public relations, social, and athletic chairmen are presidential appointments and they can be of great assistance to the ASUO by aiding the president in their respective areas.

In the past few years there has been a tendency to increase the usefulness of the cabinet. I certainly concur with this trend of thought and I hope to increase further the responsibility of the cabinet. It can assist the Senate by discussing certain problems and making proper recommendations or at least giving the Senate the benefit of its discussions.

On occasion the Senate might see fit to allow the Cabinet to make final decisions on some particular issue. This has been done already this year in connection with the Winter Carnival sponsored by Portland State college. The cabinet being a smaller group, found it much easier to meet with Portland State representatives and ferret out the necessary information.

I have the utmost respect for this year's cabinet and I feel that they will prove themselves a very worthwhile organization. I am sure that the Senate realizes the value of the cabinet as was demonstrated by its actions on the Winter Carnival.

As the year progresses and we become better acquainted with our responsibilities, I know that we will increase our effectiveness in this business of student government.

Unworkable, Unrealistic?

Stanford Daily Asks, 'Is the Liquor Law Right?'

Editor's Note: The editors of the Stanford Daily recently brought themselves considerable publicity and touched off some controversy in our neighbor state with the following thought-provoking editorial. We are reprinting it merely for your information and examination.

Unrealistic, arbitrary, unworkable — these words and many others have been applied with considerable justification to the California law which prohibits minors from purchasing liquor or consuming it in public places.

The question goes deeper than the mere consideration of the age at which young people should be allowed to start drinking, and it goes beyond the moral argument that individuals should be discouraged from drinking as long as possible.

The question must be resolved by looking at facts as they are, not as they might be if . . .

The state liquor statute, as it is now, encourages persons to break the law. This is unfortunate but true.

If a person is brought up in a home where parents allow drinking in moderation so long as the

drinking is done with their knowledge, it is unlikely that when he moves out into a college or a job this person will suddenly stop drinking. Whether right or wrong, students in college consider themselves adults and they feel they have the capacities to judge their own actions within the natural restraints imposed upon them by society.

The law must be written and enforced with this knowledge and understanding, for an unnecessary law that is willfully broken by a great number of those at whom it is aimed is a detriment to the spirit of law obedience.

This also applies to the Stanford Fundamental Standard, which is broken both in letter and spirit by a great many who simply ignore the liquor provisions and consider themselves in all other respects thoroughgoing supporters of the Fundamental Standard.

The Fundamental Standard cannot be changed to sanction violation of the law; it is the law which should be changed.

We take no issue with Frank Fullenwider and the men of the Alcoholic Beverages Commission, for they are only doing

their job in enforcing the law, however, unworkable it may be.

For the same reason, we consider Cabinet's recommendation (that the ASSU sanction no activity to be held on premises where liquor is served) a necessary and good measure.

It is the proper task of the ASSU to divorce itself completely from activities that permit, if not encourage, wholesale violation of the law.

However necessary this action may be in the short run, it will not solve the problem in the long run. The problem is that this is only a stop-gap proposition.

And in the meantime it will bring to an end many harmless but worthwhile activities because liquor is sold on the premises where the activities are held.

And it certainly will not stop Stanford students from drinking. The significant danger is that drinking will be done surreptitiously—in cars and out-of-the-way places.

Many arguments are brought up against lowering the legal drinking age, and these too have their points. It is as difficult to set an arbitrary age limit for drinking as it is for voting, for

the capacity to handle both depends so much on the individual.

Partly because of the war and also because of the economic demands that are imposed on young people, they often become relatively self-sufficient before reaching the age of 21. By the age of 18 or 19, most young people have graduated from high school and have started an independent existence either in college or at a job.

Several states have recognized the problem and permit drinking at 18 or 19. Their problem with teen-age drunk sprees and other delinquencies seems no greater than ours.

What can Stanford do? ASSU Cabinet in their discussion last Thursday night came up with a good short-run answer; possibly further discussion by this and other bodies can come up with an answer to the long-run problem.

If the problem is approached from a rational, not an irrational we-want-our-booze approach, the state legislature may become convinced that more problems may be cured than caused by permitting persons over 18 or 19 to use their own discretion about drinking.