

Editorial

Shoplifting doesn't pay

As we approach the holiday season, an increased number of students and community residents are being caught for shoplifting. The number of these arrests took a sharp rise when school started although department stores usually suffer the highest increase at Christmas time.

This is unfortunate.

Many of the people who shoplift today do not realize the implications of getting caught, the possibility of arrest, the imminence of jail or the difficulty later in trying to secure employment.

They may not also realize that the economic loss from shoplifting forces most local businesses to raise prices to compensate for theft.

The best way to prevent any of this from happening is not to shoplift. The only thing businesses can do is to prepare for it.

New students constitute a substantial percentage of those arrested in this area so a large part of the responsibility for this plight must be accepted by them. But non-students, older students and community

residents must do their fair share too.

The fear factor has always been one of the greatest deterrents in the prevention of this phenomenon and perhaps it might be well for potential shoplifters to concentrate on the disadvantages before doing their work.

But fear hasn't always done the job and merchants can't be expected to provide a full-time uniformed policeman to keep honest patrons honest.

Shoplifting is punishable with up to a year in jail, and repeat offenders are sometimes bound over to district court where they face a possible prison term.

Many businesses and some government agencies also consider any record of arrest or conviction sufficient cause to deny employment. But the implication of a criminal record should be enough to hinder any thoughts of shoplifting.

Whether it's easy to get away with, or you think the stores deserve it, or any way you look at it, it's just not worth it.

Commentary

Rah, rah, rally

By BRUCE McDONALD

As an extremely interested member of the student body, and as a former high school cheerleader, I would like to reply to Mark Tanchuck's letter of Thursday, Nov. 1, concerning cheerleaders.

Among other things, Mr. Tanchuck says "...cheerleaders are anachronistic, a holdover from past traditions (and values)." Wrong-o. Cheerleaders have been around nearly as long as modern football, and the two (as well as cheerleading and basketball) go hand-in-hand together. Both are basically part of the same traditions and values, and if one is anachronistic, so is the other. And I rather think Mr. Tanchuck is not about to call football anachronistic (because it isn't).

Why do we have cheerleaders? They serve to stimulate, control, lead, and encourage support of the team through spectator cheering. And to have a coordinated rooting section, you must have cheerleaders.

Rooting sections are still desirable things to have, despite Mr. Tanchuck's negative attitude. The cheerleaders provide entertainment through routines, stunts and acrobatics. The dance routines are done in conjunction with the band.

And, very importantly, they serve as representatives of our school and its spirit, and more practically, they represent us at those away games which not many Oregon fans are able to attend.

If cheerleaders are a 'holdover from past traditions' (remember if cheerleading is a tradition, so is football) then they are a wise tradition to keep. A tradition of cheering and supporting your team is certainly nothing to ridicule.

I personally believe one should support one's school and athletic teams, and vocal encouragement led by cheerleaders is a way the fans can really urge their team on. It's good to be at the game, but it's better to be at the game and encouraging the team by yelling.

It is rather obvious to me that Mr. Tanchuck knows nothing of the "tradition" of cheerleading. The position of cheerleader is still coveted and cheerleading still generates avid interest.

On to another "pearl of wisdom" from Mr. Tanchuck. He says, "When I go to a game I like to sit and take in the sport. I don't like to be constantly exhorted to cheer. If I want to cheer or say anything for that matter, I will. If not, I won't. I do not need someone to tell me what to do at an event for which I paid for the pleasure of enjoying."

Really, Mr. Tanchuck, how you do run on. No one says you have to yell. It's your choice. But many people, including myself, do like to yell with the cheerleaders, and we do it while completely enjoying and observing the game.

It may shock you to know this, but it takes no great mental dexterity to be able to yell and watch the game at the same time. I pay to enjoy the game and enjoy yelling at the same time. That's my choice.

Guide; Eugene directory assistance and campus information no nothing of her, the Emerald doesn't give out information on authors of letters, and those handy microfilm machines in the EMU weren't working last time I checked. So I will address my remarks to her letter in the Oct. 31st Emerald here, rather than by personal contact.

Peggy's intentions are admirable, as are a few of her remarks. But if equality is ever to be achieved, we've got to remember that sexism works both ways. Her allegation, "Men inevitably style themselves as the aggressive achievers and the final authorities on any subject (even with the regard to the sexual responses of women...)." They are, moreover, so completely obsessed with

And why get so emotional about being exhorted to cheer? Through life a person is constantly exhorted to "buy this, do that, watch this, use that." etc. What is so different about being exhorted: "Everybody yell this! Let's give a yell for the mighty Ducks! C'mon everyone yell!" and the like. It's all for the good of the team, and how that offends you I can't possibly conceive.

If you don't want to yell, feel free to just sit and watch the game rather than do both. However, there is no reason to pout just because someone who happens to be a cheerleader asks you to yell.

And what about the athletes? Here is where the real exhortation is directed. They get it from all sides, in all forms, and in all opinions. I bet the athletes would rather hear a huge block of fans yelling "Go Big Green" or something than a chorus of drunken clods screaming profanity and heaping abuse for the smallest mistake. (Some people have a habit of doing this, and it should stop. It is not helpful, and no one appreciates it, least of all the team. Some people should be a little more sportsmanlike).

The reason the cheerleaders exhort fans to yell is because not enough are adequately supporting and encouraging the team, as they think necessary. After all, the idea is for a massive roar and not single voices in a sea of faces. So they try to get you to yell — for the team, remember — with them.

As for the student body, it is my opinion that there is a majority greatly in favor of the rally — and rightly so. We should be proud of our Rally Squad. Much of the student body is probably not aware that the Oregon Rally Squad is listed as one of the top 50 squads in the nation by the International Cheerleading Foundation (which is very respected by cheerleaders and others). The Rally Squad was recently judged for a chance at the top ten. (The results of that will not be known until December, probably). I believe our squad has every chance, and I'm proud of them!!

If you have a legitimate and honest suggestion or complaint, the best thing to do is contact the cheerleaders or contact Janet Klud, the Rally Advisor. (A very nice lady.) I'm sure they would be most receptive to honest, considerate comments.

A final quote from Mr. Tanchuck, concerning cheerleaders. "I am one person who finds them to be an insult to my intelligence." Frankly, Mr. Tanchuck, I don't observe any intelligence to insult (at least in this matter). Therefore, I think you and your immature attitude are an insult to the intelligence and integrity of the Rally Squad and this student body.

Now just why don't you take your indignation and injured feelings and turn them into school spirit, and as for your mouth, instead of squawking and insulting a fine group of dedicated people, why don't you put it to work yelling and encouraging our team. You never know what will happen. Try it — you just might like it.

Bruce McDonald is a freshman in pre-journalism.

Letters

Reply to Scott Spittal

For the information of the students, I would like to clear up any incorrect conclusions which could be drawn from Scott Spittal's commentary on Oct. 29, 1973. According to Spittal the Athletic Department has "garnered at least \$3.6 million over and above their operating budget for construction of new facilities."

The athletic facilities here at Oregon have all been paid for through contributions and gate receipts. Not money from student incidental fees as he insinuates.

Autzen stadium, Mac Court, and the Hayward Field restoration have all been financed by contributions and gate receipts. In the case of Autzen stadium, Lynn McCready, a former student athlete, was general chairman of the fund raising drive which ended up building the stadium solely through contributions and gate receipts.

In his commentary, Spittal took special aim at Hayward Field. He said, "But it (money) went into Hayward Field restoration and a stadium which is only used three months out of the year." Hayward Field's restoration has been completely self-financed through contributions. Not one cent has come from any incidental fee. According to Bill Bowerman, former track coach and chairman of the fund raising drive to restore Hayward Field, a total of \$600,000 has been pledged or paid from about 500 plus contributors. The AD, as one contributor, has pledged \$60,000, roughly 10 percent of the new stadium's cost. Assistant AD director Bill Landers gives this breakdown of the \$60,000 contribution. About \$25,000 was raised from the Restoration Track Meet last June 20. The remaining \$35,000 will be paid out of gate receipts from events at Hayward Field. Not one cent, I emphasize, is coming from the students other than from personal contributions.

Contrary to what Spittal has said, the facilities (athletic) here were financed by alumni, gate receipts and students who

wanted to contribute. Money is not being "milked" out of the student body as suggested.

My final point concerns Spittal's conclusion that Hayward Field is used only three months of the year. Ask any of the 3000 kids who were a part of the summer youth program or any of the year-round joggers or any of the P.E. classes that use Hayward field if Hayward field sleeps nine months of the year!

Paul Geis
Junior, Business Administration

A small minority

I would like to voice my sincere support of the programs, policies and philosophies of our ASUO President and Vice-President, Greg Leo and Debbie Barnett. They strive to represent the needs of the students in an honest and responsive manner.

It must be difficult for Greg and Debbie to respond upon the needs of the student body when only a small minority take the time to let their wants and needs known. If this minority of accusers are to remain silent to the ASUO Executive, then I really don't see how Greg and Debbie are to respond to any kind of reasoning that could come about.

Truthfulness in any kind of government is a valued investment these days, that we all desire and cherish. I feel that we have that truthfulness from Leo-Barnett, but it is lacking from a small minority that are using lies and misconduct to further their own self-seeking goals.

Tom Smith
Senior

Joe and Peggy

Peggy L. McCormick may not exist. She's not listed in last year's Piggers

their own bodies and excrement that they find it impossible (in fact, unthinkable) that a person without a penis... could achieve... anything at all," is guilty of worse sexism than the article, "Joe's Penis." This type of over-generalization is irrational, inaccurate, and ineffective.

I fully support the equality of the sexes. I would like to see a quick eradication of sexism in our society. But I, for one, will place more emphasis on accomplishing these ends through the courts and legislatures than on complaining ineffectively about such relatively harmless stupidities as "Joe's Penis."

Robert B. Powell
Junior-psychology, political science.