

Moon Dreams

The Russians may try to land an unmanned rocket on the moon today to celebrate the 40th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution.

Clyde Tombraugh, discoverer of the planet Pluto, believes the Russians may have fired a rocket several days ago, planning for a hit today. He said:

They would have to start several days ahead of impact to travel by the most economical method. If, therefore, they intend to land on the moon at or near that time of the lunar eclipse of November 7 they may have already fired.

Tombraugh's prophecy is given credence by a statement of Ivan Alexanderson, director of Moscow radio's English language division. Alexanderson said the Russians plan to launch a moon rocket "soon." This brief hint is more than was announced before the firing of Sputnik I. And only a short statement preceded Sputnik II.

In view of the 40th anniversary celebration planned in Moscow, today is a logical time for the Russians to launch a moon rocket—if they plan to launch one in the near future. And Nikita Khrushchev said last month that the Russians "have more up our sleeves" than intercontinental ballistic missiles and earth satellites.

Another spokesman for Moscow radio, Alexandre Petrov, an announcer, said Tuesday "we have no knowledge of any Russian rocket heading for the moon." Petrov said the suggestion of a Russian rocket to the moon is "nothing more nor less than a figment of American newsmen's imaginations."

One thing is fairly certain. The Russians could put a rocket on the moon if they wanted to take the trouble, which they evidently do.

The rocket which put half-ton Sputnik II into its orbit is thought by several western scientists to be powered by a new hydrogen-borax fuel which is more powerful than our conventional rocket fuels. A Russian scientist has said that new sources of power were used to shoot Sputnik II into space.

A moon rocket would have to be only about 40 per cent more powerful than the Sputnik II rocket, according to Fred L. Whipple, director of the Smithsonian institute observatory at Cambridge, Mass. This means that a Russian moon rocket is well within the realm of possibility in the near future.

If the Russians succeed in reaching the moon today, they'll doubtless trumpet the event—as they have with the Sputniks—as an achievement of their "superior political system." But this would only serve to mask the almost primitive struggle for power at the Kremlin's top echelons.

Filthy Lucre

Everybody can use money, we're told on good authority. Even before our economic course, we would have agreed. And nowhere is money more agreeable than in big batches—earned perhaps, but more preferably given away.

Such a windfall came many ways in the form of the televised quiz show. They started slowly with a paltry \$64 Question show. As it stands now, a quarter million dollars is the limit on knowledge's (and the sponsor's) reward.

Still, the popularity of the once-dramatic quiz shows has fallen somewhat—perhaps due to the surge of the TV Western. Page one stories on the Craigs, Van Dorens, Halls and Bloomgardens are now rare. Can we conclude rashly that viewers are no longer interested in money? Hardly.

Rather the vicious circle of the TV business may be catching up with producers as the public grows weary of the same basic type of show. Or perhaps the envy of the watchers has soured many would-be experts.

Money passe? This we doubt, the administration's credit policy to the contrary. With all the activity currently in the state legislature, sports and space, money is still holding its end, however scarce, up.

Footnotes

With the half-ton "Sputnik II" now swirling through its orbit 1000 miles up, emitting battery-fed BEEPS and Pard (or is it Red Heart)-fed BARKS of propaganda at regular intervals for all the world to hear, the words of Edward Teller, "father" of the U. S. H-Bomb ring loud and clear. "Americans have nothing to fear," says Teller; "We are still safely ahead of Russia—in FOOTBALL."

And the Oregonian's reaction to Friday's Emerald editorial warning about raccoon coats heralding a return to the pre-depression frivolity (coupled with a few choice comments about the 1958 monsterpieces called automotive engineering): "Apparently the repercussions of this revival of the raccoon coat will not be as extensive as some had feared. None of the new cars is coming out with a rumble seat." Our counter-reaction: Wait'll next year!

Quote from the Stanford Daily advance story on Webfoot-Indian crucial: "And one final reminder about the Ducks; remember, they're green and yellow." Harumph! As you were saying . . .

Faculty Representative



"THEN I SAID: JUST BECAUSE YOU'RE THE STAR OF THE FOOTBALL TEAM YOU NEEDN'T THINK YOU CAN RUN MY CLASS."

James Marlow

Same Song, Second Verse, Russia Still Calls Tune

WASHINGTON (AP)—It's an old story, at least 10 years old. The Russians call the tune and this country dances. They act and we react. It's happening again.

The Russians sent two Sputniks into the sky, more evidence of their amazing progress. A tremendous American reaction, by now familiar, sets in: a great national desire to do something to offset the Russians.

It started in 1947 when Greece and Turkey, pressured by Russia, asked this country for aid. This country gave them the help in a new American policy called the Truman Doctrine.

It was the end of two postwar years of trying to work things out peacefully with Russia and the beginning of a program of trying to contain communism within its borders.

That same year President Truman proposed the Marshall Plan for Western Europe. This was, to a degree, a reaction to aggressive communism. If Europe wasn't helped to its feet, the Communists would have fertile field.

But 1948 was the big year, although for years afterward one American move after another was the result of something the Communists did.

Early that year Russia grabbed control of all Eastern Europe when Communists seized power in Czechoslovakia, the only non-Communist country behind the Iron Curtain. This country was profoundly shocked.

The Russians kept up the pressure, tried to push the West out of Berlin with a blockade. The answer to that was the Berlin Airlift which broke the blockade. Russia's ugly designs were clear enough now.

This country set up a draft law. The Senate authorized American alliances, the first in peacetime. In 1949 the United States joined with Canada and the West European countries in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

That year this country suf-

fered another gigantic shock. The Russians set off their first atomic explosion on Sept. 23. This country hadn't up to then decided to make the even greater hydrogen bomb.

But if we didn't do it, the Russians would. That could be expected. On Jan. 31, 1950, Truman ordered the hydrogen bomb developed. On Nov. 1, 1952, this country had its first hydrogen explosion. We were still ahead of Russia.

But not for long. On Aug. 21, 1953, they had their hydrogen explosion. This was truly a shock.

Meanwhile this country had been lagging with its other armaments. But not for long. The Reds attacked in Korea and we reacted by defending Korea. Then this country rushed into more military alliances—with Japan, Australia, New Zealand, Southeast Asia.

The huge American peacetime budgets are a direct result of an effort at protection against Russia.

Even President Eisenhower's Mid-East program of this year—a policy of helping any country in the area attacked by communism—was a result of Russian pressure in the Middle East.

OREGON DAILY EMERALD

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published four times in September and five days a week during the school year, except during examination 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 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.

CHARLES MITCHELMORE, Editor
GARY CAPPS, Business Manager
JACK WILSON, Editorial Page Editor
ALLEN JOHNSON, Managing Editor
GLEN GRAVES, Advertising Manager
CORNELIA FOGLE, WILLIAM COOK, Associate Editors

PHIL HAGER, News Editor
JERRY RAMSEY, Sports Editor
JOANNE MILLIGAN, Asst. Bus. Mgr.
EDITORIAL BOARD: Charles Mitchelmore, Jack Wilson, Allen Johnson, Cornelia Fogle, William Cook, Phil Hager, Jerry Ramsey, Wayne Woodman.

Make-up Editor: Wayne Woodman
Day Editors: Joan Kraus, Evelyn Olsen, Pepper Allen, Mike Forrester, Pat Treese.

Night Editors: Dave Lortie, Marlene Perkins, Al Reynolds, Barbara Stepper, Joanne Shore.

Women's Editor: Kathy Cook
Office Manager: Alice McKindrie
Asst. Adv. Mgr.: Roger Smith
Nat'l Adv. Mgr.: Charmion Ford
Executive Secretary: Pat Holey
Chief Photographer: Nathan Hull
Classified Manager: Warren Rucker
Circulation Manager: Roger Gaffey
Accounting Clerk: Erlene Whitehouse

Many Cheat Without Guilt

(ACP) — Cheat? Forty per cent or more students at a large number of colleges do it with no apology or sense of wrongdoing!

So said a national survey released a few weeks ago. And at least one college journalist makes no effort to refute it.

"This is news?" asks Dakota Student columnist Chuck Sakariassen at University of North Dakota. I thought it was a known, accepted fact!

Reading the survey results reminded Sakariassen of a recent discussion with a friend after both had "flunked a stinker."

"Men of our calibre," said the friend in dead seriousness, according to Sakariassen, "should

have been able to beat that one. If I had known the set-up, I'll tell you what I would have done . . ." and went on to explain his system.

"I'll swear he must have spent the whole two hours sneaking glances around figuring what he could have gotten away with rather than trying to pass," says the writer. "No wonder he flunked."

"My excuse? I'm just stupid." He hastens to add: "I don't mean to imply I'm above it. My white bucks are still full of ink marks from last semester's finals."

"What I'm trying to emphasize is how funny we are," he says and goes on to tell how his friend once spent eight hours making crib notes of the se-

mester's material ("really, a work of art") only to find he had unconsciously learned the stuff.

But, Sakariassen finishes, "Is it wrong?"

"There are two sides to the question. If you value honesty as a moral virtue I guess you'd say it was. But I sure wouldn't feel guilty glancing at the next guy's paper to find out who Henry VIII's third concubine from the left was if it meant the difference between a B or a C."

"Who said, 'You're only cheating yourself'? (I think it was my fourth grade teacher!)"

"Anyway, whoever it was, I disagree. I'll go along with W.C. Fields who said, 'Whatever's worth having is worth cheating for.'"