

\$100 Recognition

The ASUO senate, in its meeting last Thursday, debated the question for a short time, then decided to approve a \$100 expenditure for the purchase of "recognition" keys, to be presented to this year's senators at the end of the term. Those who argued against the keys said that it was a needless expenditure and that the keys weren't really very good "keepsakes," indeed if that was their purpose. Those who favored the purchase used the rather dubious arguments of "they've done it in the past" and "nobody will complain if we spend the \$100."

Wait a minute, senators. One-hundred bucks is 100 bucks. Just because it's been done in the past is no reason to do it now. And, besides that, somebody will (and has—see Letters to the Editor) complain about it.

The senate certainly has the right to procure some form of recognition tokens. Its members have served the school and deserve something to serve as a reminder in the future. But why spend \$2.50 per senator simply because it's already in the budget and has been approved by senate groups in the past?

Paper certificates could be purchased for less than 10 cents apiece. They can be framed and would certainly serve as better "recognition" than a key that is rarely worn and even more rarely displayed. Or, let's take another solution: if the senators are so bent on getting keys, let them buy the keys themselves.

The Emerald hopes the senators will get something less expensive than \$100 worth of keys for their own recognition, and put some of those 100 bucks back into the general budget.

Three to Get Ready

Does anyone have serious objection to a three-day weekend? We've come to the conclusion that a paltry 48 hours isn't nearly enough time for the proper transaction of "weekend business," so we've been toying with the idea of the three-day break: Satur-

day, Double-Saturday and Sunday.

Admittedly, some calendars might have to be changed—an added day a week for 12 months is 52 extra days, but surely Marilyn Monroe and the Playmates of a popular magazine (not yet banned from Lane county newsstands) would be just as fetching on a calendar with 417 days as on one with the standard 365.

And think how many extra special days could be devised by obscure societies. "National Graham Cracker Day" and "International Bathysphere Week" could take their places alongside "National Rare Book Week" and "Eat More Rutabagas Month" which are presently observed. There might even be enough days left over to create a special "National Day Day" and a "National Week Week."

But to return to more concrete reasons: "Breathes there a man with eyes of red, who Sunday morning has not said '@%\$*&!! where has this weekend gone?" Term papers and interminable reading assignments really raise the devil with Saturday and Sunday activities, particularly after-dark activities. So we have no hesitancy about suggesting the extra day. We call it "Double-Saturday" because Saturday would be worth twice as much if we were sure that "tomorrow morning" (Sunday) was two days away. Thus, house dances could be two-night affairs—one-night for the party and one for dancing.

Naturally, there could be some drawbacks to the three-day weekend. Spiteful instructors (disgruntled because pay-day would be four days later each month) might make staggering Friday assignments with Dbl.-Sat. in mind. These professors would have to be removed. And for co-eds, a weekend "campus" might take on life-term dimensions.

There is a strong possibility that the present Julian calendar system will soon undergo drastic revisions. Maybe the revisers will remember their undergraduate days and sneak in a Double-Saturday for the poor college student. Suggestion: this might be a suitable campaign issue for the upcoming ASUO elections, or else a worthy Druids project.

Architecture Major?



"YOUR TESTS HERE SEEM TO INDICATE YOU HAVE A KEEN INTEREST IN THE AREA OF FORM & STRUCTURE."

Jack Wilson

Mass Advertising Needed For Capitalism, Democracy

If someone were about to slice one segment out of the American way of life, and were to hand me the choice between keeping art or advertising, I'm afraid I would have to take advertising.

Advertising Recognition Week is over, but there seems to be some doubt as to the advisability of even putting up with advertising, let alone recognizing it as worthwhile. That doubt comes from a failure to realize the place of advertising in a capitalistic-democratic scheme of things.

America is founded on capitalism and democracy. The two go hand-in-glove, and advertising is a bulwark of both.

Let's look first at capitalism. The word has become almost taboo in some circles, and certainly few of us would enjoy announcing to a starving peasant that "I'm a capitalist." Perhaps it's time to find a new word, for whatever you may call it, our economic system has given this country the highest living standard the world has ever seen.

How does advertising fit in? Let's ask, first, where capitalism differs from other economic systems. Its primary distinguishing feature is, of course, competitive private enterprise, as differentiated from public or monopolized control of the production of goods and services.

Secondly, capitalism relies upon private sale of goods and services to the consumer, instead of a regulated distribution as socialism or capitalism would provide.

Thus, an operating capitalistic system requires both competitive private enterprise and private selling—and in an integrated whole such as America is, that selling must be nationwide if the system is to be efficient. Mass, competitive selling is the backbone of a capitalistic system.

Granted, competitive selling would continue if all advertising were eliminated. But it would no longer be mass selling. Word-

of-mouth would suffice to circulate products in one community, but it takes national advertising to create and utilize a mass market, to the end that prices drop and the standard of living rises.

Mass sales are not achieved with subtle, esthetically-pleasing advertising. It has been argued that selling does not have to be blatant or unethical. I'll grant the unethical part, as will most advertising people (including the gray-flannel crowd), but advertising often has to bypass beauty to reach the masses and obtain efficient selling. It is through selling, not through beauty, that advertising makes its contribution to America.

Still, however, if it were only support of America's economy that qualified advertising for endorsement, it would be running a poor second to art. We could struggle along all right, economically, if there were no advertisements.

But without advertising, our free press and other media of communications would either disappear altogether or fall into monopolistic hands.

How long would our way of life endure if there were no independent newspapers, magazines and broadcasting stations? Turn the question around and you have your answer: how long would the Kremlin's rule of tyranny endure if Russia had those independent communications media?

What would happen if there were no more advertising? Prices of newspapers and magazines would shoot up beyond the means of most of the public. Circulations would drop, prices would go even higher, and most publications would be out of business. Those that survived would be unable to afford large-scale newsgathering practices or the experts in many fields that combine to make the American citizen the best-informed man in the world.

There is really no choice at all. Take art over advertising and you lose freedom. (Great art is not produced where there is no freedom—witness Russian and German art.) Take advertising over art, and you keep freedom—and art is free to return, stronger than ever.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Emerald Editor:

In my last letter I intimated that the ASUO Senate was a mere social activity and a rubber stamp. Its latest activities would seem to confirm my conjecture. At the Senate meeting last week our illustrious Senate was so inspired by the merit of its own service that its members voted themselves \$100 worth of recognition keys.

The three ostensible points brought forth in support of this rather expensive indulgence in mutual appreciation were: it is traditional, it is already budgeted, it would be "nice." As far as the first is concerned, it was pointed out by faculty adviser DuShane. If the mere fact that previous Senates have deemed themselves worthy of such remuneration has any bearing upon the present Senate's consideration of whether or not it deserves such compensation, then I infer that the Senate exhibited no original thought

whatever and, by virtue of this, proved itself an even more dogmatic rubber stamp than I had previously conceived. The second point, that it is already budgeted, seems equally ridiculous. It is amazing that the majority of our illustrious Senators never stopped to think that the Senate does have some slight prerogative in controlling its own funds and, therefore, may, if it so desires, think for itself. For obvious reasons I shall not consider the third point.

The real issue is (or, should have been) whether or not this group, presumably elected to represent the Associated Students of the University of Oregon has any legitimately ethical grounds for usurping a considerable amount from the ASUO funds for the purchase of useless jewelry. Obviously not! If the majority of the Senate honestly feels that it deserves such special compensation, I suggest that it compile a list of its constructive accomplishments during its tenure and note its extreme brevity. Maybe this would be some slight incentive for the Senate to start accomplishing something for the good of the students it supposedly represents.

E. K. Moss

Junior in Chemistry

(Editor's Note: See editorial comment above).

Emerald Editor:

Presently appearing on the S.U. bulletin board is the question "Which title belongs to the University of Oregon—The Country Club or an educational institution?" How ridiculous! The school in its present passive state—wandering through indifference and confusion of dry zones, closing hours, G.P.A.'s, satellites, etc.—is neither.

To say that the U. of O. is a true "system of higher education" is mere folly. For instance, the majority of out-of-state students attend the University because of low entrance requirements and a minimum of effort for graduation. This follows an increasing trend on campus "to just get by." Is this indicative of a "system of higher education"? Is the quest of a living organization to have a higher GPA than others actually an individual endeavor for knowledge? Or is it rather a symbol of vanity in the pride of one's organization and/or the result of mass fraternal hysteria? One of the "proofs" of the University's educational status was that the campus GPA of fall term was the highest in several years. If Harvard, or other comparable institutions, were to drop a few points in their GPA, might this lessen their rating as a TRUE system of higher education?

(Continued on page 3)

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.

ALLEN JOHNSON, Editor
GARY CAPPS, Business Manager