

Tax Troubles

State senator Warren Gill, GOP candidate for governor, reiterated here Thursday the pledge that he will veto any increase in income taxes or a state tax on property. It's a fact that Oregon has been bypassed by industry, and that the state tax structure has been responsible for at least part of this failure to attract new income. Presently, an authority from Princeton is studying the tax structure and will make recommendations.

Until then, however, a feud over the sales tax has been hot between the gubernatorial hopefuls. Gill, one of the most vehement voices, pointed out the unfairness of the current property tax in that it penalizes the poor family who has to pay the same milage rate as the wealthy family.

"One of the chief differences," said Gill, "between communism and capitalism is the right to property." This right is endangered, he charged, when a heavy property tax is causing an Oregonian to buy back his house from the government every 10 or 12 years.

Another drawback to the property tax, which most states have abandoned, is that the assessed valuation of property may be distorted by shifts in the business cycle, incompetent assessors, unfair administration, and other complexities.

Gill proposes the obvious alternative to the property tax, a sales tax, which 31 states now have. The regressive-tax argument was thrown back at him, though, by a member of the audience who asserted that the sales tax actually penalized the poor, too, since the lower income group spends a larger share for taxable goods, food and clothing, and simply because they spend greater portions of their incomes.

Using a hypothetical example, Gill then demonstrated that the property tax is even more regressive than the sales tax.

Other arguments against a sales tax are that it is an inconvenience to pay bits of change constantly whereas other taxes are paid in lump-sum, and that it is harder to collect than a "lump" tax.

At any rate, the state does not have a uniform or up-to-date tax plan, and some changes should be made.

Higher Quality

Wendell H. Stephenson, professor of history, struck at many good points last week in his talk on the quality of education at the University.

We especially agreed with him on the value of reading from many sources for a course rather than just the cut-and-dried, and often flowery, textbooks. For one thing, a text, say in political science, will outline the various components and cases for beliefs whereas a book by Lippmann or Machiavelli goes deeply into the ideas and causes the reader to form an opinion. And this, instead of memorizing values of this and functions of that, is the learning process.

Stephenson's comments on the value of getting into the "reading habit" were excellent, we thought. The seminar course "politics and the novel" is an example of this direct connection between learning and books other than texts.

Quality education and Oregon's "country club" reputation run parallel in a number of respects. The causes, effects and "remedies" for the reputation are extremely difficult to pin-point. The Emerald's three-part series on the subject has brought a wide range of comment and opinion. We're happy to see this. It's doubtful that any one person can come up with a "solution," as such—but an interest in ourselves as students and what others think of us is certainly a healthy one.

Dunking Wear



Dave Cass

University Is Not Free From Conformity, Apathy

Someday, when a very erudite man surveys the tortuous gropings of 20th Century America,

he will be applauded in some very scholarly journal as having discovered "conformity" as the nexus that brings all into focus.

Mistakenly or not, this man will see, through this concept, the explanation of such varied events as our lemming-like adherence to political shibboleth, the glorification of the smutty, the depths, as real life, the undulating currents of fad and fashion—Billy Graham, the sack dress, and the "beat generation."



The question that this man will have to ask is, was this more than a superficial conformity? Certainly, he will reason, in their "mass production" society (of goods, the arts, and souls) a great deal would have to be the same over wide areas. But underneath all that, when the individual's soul was bared, how much of this seeming sameness was only illusory?

Certain matters would betray this sort of naivete. Opulence has not been an unqualified good, nor can it be, as the socialist reformers would like us to believe. Its price has been to a large extent brazen materialism, and an intense desire to fill the void of leisure with the trivial. For many the trivial and material have become the end-all of life, they have no deeper self. And values such as these are the most amenable to conformity. The decision isn't between a house or a fine picture, but between types of houses.

I'm always rather surprised when somebody shows signs of hurt at my suggestion that a nice car isn't the most important thing in life, but in fact, far from it. Also beyond the scope of the imaginative powers of many people is that clothes, or saying the right thing, may not be central.

The conformity is even more disciplined than this agreement

on ultimate values; the "right" car or the "right" clothes are just as important.

But beyond these that exist, that think little if at all, the problem shifts to the realm of ideas. Not only is thought discouraged, but particular brands of thought are inveighed against. From the security of the belief that what is right, we have the scorn of new thought or the questioning of old.

You might feel compelled at this point to cry out, things aren't this bad, that I'm talking about the "great unwashed," that what I'm saying will be true of the masses in any society.

True. But, can such a reality long coincide side-by-side with the American ideal, which receives great homage but little thought? If the hope of our generations lies with an elite, what about the question of compatibility? And how effective is such an elite without a drastic revision? The childish activities of very capable political leaders, as well as some not so capable, lead me to wonder if the two aren't mutually exclusive.

And don't kid yourselves about our intellectual elite. Their great bastion, the university, is subject to this pervasive influence. Witness the proliferation of business administration schools. And academic specialization is not free from the dangers of dogmatism, conformity, and narrowness.

The dilemma is this: the two sides of the coin of opulence are conformity and apathy, the alternative is bread and circuses.

Neither is desirable, but no other path seems open. What to do?

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.

PHIL HAGER, Editor
BILL BRYANT, Business Manager

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Emerald Editor:

As I walked down Hello Walk, Monday at 1:15 p.m., I was in a hurry to get to the Side in order to finish preparing my assignment for my two o'clock class. However, as my size does not command respect from boys, nor does the fact that I am a member of the other sex, it was deemed, by some young men in want of something constructive to do, that I was not to carry out my wishes but must entertain them.

These "noble, shining examples of American Youth," "Our Hope for the Future," Order of the O boys ordered that I greet them all with "Hello" which I happily did and asked me whether I was a freshman. I respectfully answered that I was a "Sophomore in a Hurry to Get to the Side to Study." Evidently the traditions have changed again this year for in the ensuing fight between me and these gentlemen they succeeded in skinning my elbow, bruising my arms, spraining two fingers on my right and writing hand, and tearing my petticoats, and finally these strong young men succeeded in hoisting me, legs flying and skirts up to my neck, into the pool.

If I am criticized for not submitting meekly to their tactics for attention and notoriety may I say that my ladylike behavior equalled their gentlemanly behavior. I was and am indignant, embarrassed, and ashamed.

Indignant because of the rude rough, authoritarian manner in which they carried out their "fun." Indignant also because they have changed traditions to fit their desires. Have they the

right to do so? Or is it the right of the student body to change them? And if they are traditions, why must they be changed and enforced? Isn't the dunking traditionally carried out at Fenton Pool and since when is it traditional to dunk upper class women?

Embarrassed because in the process of the dunking these young gentlemen did not care where they were handling me nor did they care where my skirts were.

Ashamed because these young men represent the University of Oregon and thus represent me. Their actions are not actions of which anyone can honestly say they are proud.

I would like to know if this group will take the responsibility of the \$5 damage done to my clothes. I will not ask them to be responsible for the cuts, bruises and sprains—they will heal in time. But as for my respect for the Order of the O—I am afraid neither money nor time will pay for the damage.

These opinions are held by many individuals on this campus. Individuals who do not wish to comply with "traditions" that vary each year. Students who do not believe that their rights as individuals make it necessary to react to such treatment with laughs and screams and admiration for the hyper-masculinity of the young men.

If this letter is criticized for being an emotional instead of a rational reaction may I say it was written in indignance, embarrassment, and shame; but may I defend it by asking whether such action can be handled with reason or whether

this example of their behavior shows that perhaps the correct approach to such action is like action.

Kathy Erickson
Sophomore in
Pre-Medicine

Emerald Editor:

Realizing full well that the editorial page is a form of privileged communication and that an editorial writer does not have to justify his opinion with an analytical approach, we feel that comment should be made concerning the editorial, "The Amendments," appearing in the May 9, 1958 edition of The Emerald.

In the first paragraph, the writer states that the two amendments were "conflicting." In succeeding paragraphs he says that the first amendment provided that senatorial candidates could not be elected president, and that the second amendment says living groups would elect their own representatives. We fail to see how this points to any "conflict." Apparently, if there is a "conflict" involved, the editorial writer did not see fit to make this known to his readers, who supposedly are less informed than he.

The writer states that the petition amendment should not go into effect and gives his reasons therefore, in total disregard of the fact that the amendment was passed upon by the voters and has in fact been adopted and is presently in effect.

The writer's prejudice, which is shown by his handling of the issue, comes too late, as it should have been pointed out in

(Continued on page 3)