

## Wild Notes

## Why Fred Young Thinks Deferred Rushing is Bad

by Fred Young

Deferred rushing has been one of our profound interests ever since its mention as a possibility on the Oregon campus. It's been cussed and discussed to considerable degree, and the wisest conclusion to have yet been reached is the admission that deferred rushing is a very important problem. A problem which deserves much consideration, and which will be severely handicapped by being forced.

We had better warn now that this article won't discuss both sides of the issue. It has been said that deferred living would work out the best if

deferred rushing were initiated along with it. Since deferred living has been decreed a necessary evil, we will herewith offer reasons why there is little or no basis for blindly adopting deferred rushing, and its many shortcomings, along with it.

First, let's toss in this bit of background for what it's worth. In 1945 President Newburn's University of Iowa employed the deferred rushing plan in conjunction with their fine dormitory system. In 1947 they abandoned deferred rushing since they felt it didn't work. This is but one of many examples which we'll cite on request.



Let's enumerate some of the obvious shortcomings of the deferred rushing system. First, deferred rushing rules set up an "artificial barrier" between the fraternity members and the freshmen. This is because rushing rulings usually do not allow any more than a casual "hello" between the fraternity member and freshman prior to the official rushing period.

Deferred rushing creates suspicion and friction between the fraternity groups from registration until the final pledge day. This suspicion is not unlike any encountered between active competitors in any of the phases of our dynamic countryside. This will disrupt the usual harmony prevalent on our campus and in the dormitories.

Deferred rushing results in a continuous rushing period—formal, informal, and even secret from the day of registration until pledge day. Among the new students it stimulates the perpetual thinking of and discussing of the possibilities of "making a fraternity."

Within the fraternity chapters deferred rushing generates constant preoccupation with rushing plans and the new student personalities. It is detrimental to the good scholarship of the fraternity members and the rushees. Deferred rushing is also the most expensive form of rushing financially. This increased expense would have to be added to the already high cost of college living.

Deferred rushing causes being invited to join a fraternity to assume too much importance in the eyes of the freshman students and their families at

home. It puts fraternities so much in the limelight that they seem not only to be desirable but also "unique institutions," instead of just one of many campus associations.

It has been acknowledged by University officials that deferred living will leave fewer than ever upperclassmen in the dormitories. At the same time when freshmen need most the friendly guidance, encouragement, and contact with upperclassmen; when the University needs the aid of such upperclassmen in the work of introducing and assimilating new students, deferred rushing rules bar all such association with these acknowledged campus leaders.

Some mention has been made that deferred rushing allows the freshman more time to take a look at University living organizations. However, it seems reasonable that whether the freshman has four days of four months to establish his preference the question will sift down to the same two, three, or more equally divided groups of friends, and the final decision will be just as trying.

The first consideration in evaluating any rushing plan should be, "how will this plan help the freshman student find a place on campus, and how will it aid him to become an intelligent, well-adjusted college citizen?" This lends all the more reason why the "deferred rushing question" should receive a great deal of consideration, and the bodies formulating the policy should receive the student-body's patience and assurance.

Columnist's views are not necessarily those of the editor. (See below).—Editor.

## An Editorial

## And Why We Think He Has Little Faith in Fraternities

Elsewhere on this page, Emerald music columnist Fred Young blows out some sour notes about deferred rushing.

Young is entitled to his own opinions; however he presumes a great deal about deferred rushing that "ain't necessarily so." And it is on these presumptions that he bases his arguments.

For example, "deferred rushing rules set up an 'artificial barrier' between the fraternity members and freshmen." At present there are no deferred rushing rules at Oregon. Any such rules will most likely be made by the Interfraternity Council and Panhellenic. Young must have a rather low opinion of these groups if he thinks they are so stupid as to follow the bad examples some other institutions have set up concerning deferred rushing.

**If fraternities can trust one another to abide by the rules which IFC does set up, then they need not fear that houses will attempt to rush individuals early. If the fraternities cannot trust one another to this extent, then there is something basicly wrong with the fraternity system.**

There should be no "suspicion and friction" between fraternity groups unless fraternities behave in such a way as to arouse the suspicion of one another. If fraternities behave this way, they should not blame deferred rushing.

There is no need for a continual rushing period

of any type. New students will undoubtedly discuss fraternities. This is an indication that they will know by the late rushing period what they are getting into. Fraternities should welcome this discussion. And there is no need to assume that the freshman and new students will talk themselves into a fraternity frenzy.

We do not see where deferred rushing would be the most expensive form of rushing. Young does not elaborate on this statement; perhaps he should.

**If the fraternity wishes to constantly preoccupy itself with rushing plans, it is asking for work that is not necessary.**

With rush week at the beginning of a college career, as it is now, the joining of a fraternity is given emphasis way out of line with its true value. By placing rush week later in the first year, a student is better able to judge the role of the fraternity in campus life by having seen the fraternity in relation to the other elements of the University.

Far from making the fraternity seem a "unique institution," the student can see it as one of many campus associations, since he has seen more than just the fraternity. During rush week, as it is now, the fraternity is the only campus association the student sees; the rest he merely hears about.

The administration has realized it must organize an effective counselling program for the dormitor-

ies. It will accept this responsibility, and we must see to it that the responsibility is not shirked.

**Where Young received the idea that "deferred rushing rules bar all such association with acknowledged campus leaders we do not know. He has presumed far too much. Deferred rushing does not mean they will take no participation whatever in campus activities. It merely means they will not pledge a fraternity the first week of fall term. This is not fatal.**

It may seem reasonable to Young that a student will make the same choice after four months as he would have after four days; but it does not seem reasonable to us.

It may be the decision will be as "trying," but the student will be more fully aware that his living group is not the only living group; that it is the one he pledges.

With Young's last paragraph we agree.

With most of Young's arguments we do not agree. Simply because we feel he presumes a great deal that should not be.

His attitude seems to be, deferred rushing will not work because the fraternities will not let it work. Whether he thinks this, or whether it is now we who are presuming too much, we do know this:

If a group sincerely wishes to help the individual, it must put side selfish interests for the common good.



Opinions expressed in editorials are those of the writer, and do not claim to represent the opinions of the ASUO or of the University. Initialed editorials are written by associate editors. Unsigned editorials are written by the editor.

Opinions expressed in an editorial page by-lined column are those of the columnist, and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the editor or his associates.

The OREGON DAILY EMERALD, published daily during the college year except Saturdays, Sundays, holidays and final examination periods by the Associated Students, University of Oregon. Subscription rates: \$2.00 a term, \$4.00 for two terms and \$5.00 a year. Entered as second class matter at the postoffice Eugene, Oregon.

DON A. SMITH, Editor

JOAN MIMNAUGH, Business Manager

BARBARA HEYWOOD, HELEN SHERMAN, Associate Editors.

GLENN GILLESPIE, Managing Editor

DON THOMPSON, Advertising Manager

News Editors: Anne Goodman, Ken Metzler. Sports Editors: John Barton, Sam Fidman. Assistant News Editor: Mary Ann Deisman. Chief Night Editor: Lorna Larson.

## Crotchety Old Vet

## Cold Feet and Veterans' Dentist Bills

by Steve Loy

Problem, what to say about the weather? We all agree that the weather is just two steps away from terrible. The people at the infirmary know that slush is conducive to wet feet and sore throats. The guy with only one pair of shoes knows slush soaks through faster than rain. The gals with the sore noses know snow is tough on the complexion when applied by an overzealous adolescent. "Let it snow, let it snow . . ."

Do all you vets know you may have free dental work coming? If you need work on any teeth which were treated while you were in the service they can be fixed free. Naturally there is red-tape. It begins when you go to the VA contact office in Emerald Hall. They send to Portland for your record, (if it is there yet), then you get an examination here in Eugene. The examination report goes back

(Please turn to page three)